







VISITATION CHARGES

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTIONS TO THE
ROLLS SERIES. Collected and Edited by ARTHUR
HASSALL, M.A., Student, Tutor, and sometime Censor
of Christ Church. *Medium 8vo, 12s. 6d. net.*

LECTURES ON EUROPEAN HISTORY,
1519-1648. I. *Charles V.* (11 Lectures). II. *The Political
History of Europe from the Resignation of Charles V.*
(11 Lectures). III. *The Political History of Europe
during the Thirty Years' War* (10 Lectures). Also
Two Supplementary Lectures: *Survey of the Reigns of
Louis XIII. and Philip IV.; The Peace of Westphalia.*
Medium 8vo.

ORDINATION ADDRESSES. Edited by the
Rev. E. E. HOLMES. With Photogravure Portrait.
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

THE EARLY PLANTAGENETS. With two
Maps. *Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d. (Epochs of Modern History.)*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

VISITATION CHARGES

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY AND
CHURCHWARDENS OF THE DIOCESES OF

CHESTER AND OXFORD

BY

WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D.

EDITED BY

E. E. HOLMES

HONORARY CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH AND VICAR OF SONNING
FORMERLY DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1904

All rights reserved

PREFACE

I HAVE been advised to redeem a promise made in the Preface to the *Ordination Addresses*, and to publish the Bishop's *Visitation Charges*, delivered in the dioceses of Chester and Oxford;—Charges containing the Bishop's "beliefs and impressions" on "great principles," and on many of the most important questions of the day. With one eye on the publisher and the other on the public, I have omitted matters of purely local interest, such as diocesan statistics, etc. Obituary notices, too, have been omitted, although it is difficult not to wish for space to record fully a great man's views on great men—such men as *Dean Liddell*, "looked up to," by the Bishop, "as a scholar, a wise administrator, and a most straightforward and righteous man"; *Liddon*, "so distinctly an Oxford man in all senses that we can never cross the great quadrangle without thinking of him as still in spirit working on us and with us"; *Aubrey Moore*, "next to the Dean of St. Paul's and Liddon, our greatest loss, the greatest loss that the whole Church has sustained during the years I am reviewing"; *Archdeacon Palmer*, whose "long acquaintance with Oxford—the University and colleges—acquaintance with all men and things that were worth knowing for more than fifty years . . . made him almost a unique element in the continuity of University life, and also in that continuity of connection between the University and Church life

which, under however varied and modified forms, must continue to exist until the salt has lost its savour"; *Dean Butler*, "the great Dean Butler, of Wantage, the bravest, the most clear-sighted, most steadfast, immovable champion of good works"; *Noel Freeling*, and many others, whose names remind us of the affectionate debt of gratitude the present owes to the past. With these omissions, the Charges are published practically as they were delivered.

E. E. HOLMES

SONNING, 1904

CONTENTS

VISITATION CHARGE DELIVERED IN THE DIOCESE OF CHESTER

	PAGE
OCTOBER, 1886	I

VISITATION CHARGES DELIVERED IN THE DIOCESE OF OXFORD

JUNE, 1890	65
APRIL AND MAY, 1893	138
MAY AND JUNE, 1896	238
MAY AND JUNE, 1899	306

VISITATION CHARGE

DELIVERED IN

The Diocese of Chester

PRIMARY VISITATION CHARGE

OCTOBER, 1886

Church Courts.

THE only legislative measure passed during these years which bears generally on the body of the clergy is the Pluralities Acts Amendment Act of 1885, which, by reason of the part assigned to the clergy of each archdeaconry in the choice of Commissioners of inquiry, has no doubt been brought within the notice of you all. This Act is a very important one, and, if its value were not impaired by the failure to provide means for paying expenses, would be more important still. At the same time this very difficulty must be a check upon a wanton or careless employment of it; whilst, for cases which demand summary and decisive treatment, funds may be expected to be always forthcoming. Without attempting, what indeed is quite unnecessary, to analyse the Act, I will call your attention to one or two sections of it. The second clause contains a sort of definition of the duties, the neglect of which calls for the enforcement of the Act; "not only the regular and due performance of divine service on Sundays and holy days, but also all such duties as any clergyman holding a benefice is bound by law to perform, or the performance of which is solemnly promised by every clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his ordination, and the performance of which shall have been required of him in writing by the Bishop." It might be desired perhaps that the definition had been more circumstantial; but I think that where there is such a tendency

as is prevalent in these days to turn minimums into maximums, it is better as it is. It is not, however, very clear at first sight what connection subsists between the three clauses of the definition, whether before the beginning of proceedings it will be necessary to prove that the negligent incumbent has neglected the Bishop's admonition to perform his legal and covenanted duties, and whether, without such admonition, he may regard his neglects as authorised. I hope that none of the clergy of this diocese will ever think of quibbling about this; but I need not tell you that the law is not made for the righteous man, but for the negligent, and, in this case, for those guilty of a sort of negligence that implies much more than indolence, self-will, or disobedience—no less than breach of solemn covenant and carelessness of those for whom Christ died and whose souls He has put in their especial charge.

The sixth and seventh clauses provide for the attendance of witnesses and production of documents. No doubt the clauses were intended to meet the difficulty which arises from the reluctance of parishioners to testify against their clergymen in such matters, a reluctance which has much of its basis in good feeling. It is unfortunate, I think, that it should be comparatively easy to find witnesses who will testify to a minute ritual variation, which may or may not be legal and customary; difficult to find witnesses who will speak out on matters of intemperance, immorality, or neglect of duty. But such apparently is the case. No new powers are given by these clauses, nor any other modes of enforcing evidence, than are common to the higher spiritual courts, the Consistory and Court of Arches, and these powers are confessedly extremely difficult of application. The following clauses, enabling the Bishop to fix the stipend and number of curates appointed in consequence of the action taken on the result of the inquiry, and the fourteenth clause, allowing the issue of dispensation for pluralities in cases where two churches are within four miles of one another, one of which is not above the value of £200 a year, have some importance in their

bearing on the economy of ecclesiastical funds. The full force, however, of the new Act can only be worked out by a careful reading of it in connection with the Clergy Discipline Act, 1 & 2 Victoria c. 106, the provisions of which it for the most part enlarges, and the working of which, on both the old and new lines, it was intended to facilitate.

In connexion with the subject of ecclesiastical discipline, I will venture to make a digression, which will enable me not only to state one or two points of personal explanation, but to put before you one or two principles, which seem to me of importance, for a mere general and appreciative view of the subject. I mean, of course, the recent Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts.

The Commissioners were directed to inquire into the constitution and working of the ecclesiastical courts as created or modified under the Reformation statutes of the 25th and 26th years of King Henry VIII. and any subsequent Acts, and to report their opinion on the matter submitted for their consideration.

The action of this Commission occupied a great part of the years 1882 and 1883, and the report has afforded material for a good deal of consideration and discussion ever since. No legislation has followed from that report; the time has not come for any hopeful attempt at legislation, and I do not think it likely that the time ever will come for legislation on the precise lines of the recommendations of the Commissioners. It was a large Commission, composed of men of very different training, opinions, and ways of looking at questions; and the report was, if not exactly a compromise, rather the resultant of more than two sets of forces working in different directions, than the distinct collective and definitive judgment of men who were agreed on fundamental principles. Hence perhaps it might be anticipated that no strong party among the Commissioners would be very anxious to push the recommendations as a whole. And the result has proved so much. There might, indeed, *à priori* be different opinions as to what the object of such a Commission ought to be. A careful examina-

tion into the history of ecclesiastical jurisprudence was one thing ; an attempt to solve by practical legislation the difficulties which, on all hands, were found to attend on the present conditions of ecclesiastical litigation, was quite another. The former proceeding might well have operated to allay urgent discontents, showing that the evils now complained of were inherent, almost of necessity, in the existing relations between Church and State, and that many inconveniences must be endured because the cost of ridding ourselves of them would be so great as to involve vital changes. Such I, for my part, believe one great lesson of all Church history to be ; it would help to comfort those who were distressed, to suggest patience and perseverance to those who were weary with struggling for the right cause, as it seemed to them, and it would show the necessity and, perhaps, to some extent, inspire the feeling of sympathy in men whose opinions on minor points were discordant, in the view of the great end and aim that all have at heart. The second object, the proposing of distinct measures of legislation, by a body of men who were not at one on the principles to be worked out, must of necessity be something of a compromise, although even then, on such a condition, we might have proposed alternative schemes, each of which, on its own lines, would have been consistent, and under certain conditions practicable : it would not have been in our province to provide the conditions, it would have been enough to indicate them, and to leave to the statesman who should see fit to initiate legislation on the subject to choose the conditions, and to determine the plan among the alternatives which he would propose to Parliament. That idea was not followed. A string of formulated recommendations was appended to the historical conclusions of the report. Even then these recommendations might have been regarded more as materials for the basis of an enactment, than as a hard-and-fast plan, for although, in a certain portion of them, several articles were so put together as to receive the consent of the several Commissioners only in their collective form—in such a way that the subtraction of any one

of them would exonerate the Commissioners from responsibility for any or all of the other recommendations—that was not the case with the whole series, some part of which might have been selected at once for piecemeal legislation. That, however, was not contemplated; the recommendations still stand before the world as a whole, as the resultant of several strong lines of opinion, as a scheme which none of its signatories can be thought to have very much at heart, and as a draft, the provisions of which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to embody in a Bill to be presented to Parliament.

This being the case, as it appears to me, I might very well be asked, Why did you sign the report, and why did you sign without reservation? I think that my answer would be, I signed the report and recommendations without reservation because I did not wish to weaken the good effects that might be expected from it, even if no legislation should follow; because I did not wish, by singling out particular points for exception, to accentuate my own acceptance of the general tenour of the other recommendations, and, further, because in the minutes appended to the report I had had an opportunity of presenting my own view of what the most important feature of the recommendations, the idea of the supreme tribunal of appeal, ought to be. As I felt myself relieved from the responsibility of making a reservation, I was at liberty to sign the report as the result of the deliberations of a large body of practical men, as an expression of opinion as to a state of things, a *modus vivendi*, with which, viewed as a whole, and in relation to present circumstances, Churchmen might fairly be expected to content themselves, and as, although far from my ideal of what such a thing ought to be, a safe and desirable step in advance towards such an ideal.

In the sketch which I offered to the Commissioners of what I conceived the final step of appeal should be in all litigation, in which doctrine and ritual are concerned, I thought that I had propounded a scheme which would have satisfied reasonable men without any great need to provide safeguards in the lower stages of proceeding.

If we had, that is to say, a supreme tribunal, to which men would be ready and willing to render obedience, seeing no theoretical or practical escape from responsibility for such obedience, it would be of less importance that the recourse to that tribunal should be guarded either by limiting the power of initiation, by defining the character of the inferior tribunals, by prohibiting more than one appeal, or the like; under such circumstances it would be safe to leave wanton litigants to the deterrent risk or punishment of heavy costs.

You will see that, in saying this, I am touching a point on which much discussion has been taken, the power exercised by the Bishop, under both the Clergy Discipline Act and the Public Worship Regulation Act, of withholding his consent for the prosecution of delinquents or supposed delinquents. Such a power would be, it is true, unnecessary, if the supreme tribunal of appeal was one which enjoyed the confidence of the clergy: but even then it would be well to retain the power as a check upon petty persecution and on the attempts at personal annoyance and even oppression, which too great facilities of recourse to legal proceedings seem to encourage. We must remember that on all historical and religious theory, even on the word of the apostle himself, the office of a Bishop is to protect his clergy where they need protection: and that where, as here, his judicial functions have been, by long custom and material restriction, so much limited as they have now become, the accompanying power, the check which the law has given him on the misuse of authority, which is based really on what is intrinsically his own authority, ought not to be taken from him. The Bishop is the protector of the clergy as well as the judge, whose judicial power, exercised in his name, is exercised by a court in which he has hardly any voice, and for which he has only a very remote, indirect responsibility, or none at all.

I am, however, told that in the exercise of this discretionary power the Bishop is really acting as a judge, using a judicial weapon to stay the liberty of litigation,

and to limit the right which every subject possesses of proceeding to the *summa justitia* in Church or State for decision of his claims. I must decline, once for all, to debate the second limb of this objection, even if I stand alone in my opinion that a charge of ritual or doctrinal irregularity, which is liable to end in deprivation or suspension, is really a penal charge on which the accused person has every right to every sort of protection which the analogy of the criminal law gives him. But as to the first objection, that the Bishop is acting as a judge in determining whether or no he shall consent to the initiation of proceedings, I will say a word or two, because the allegation contains or insinuates a principle, or rather a prejudice, which I wish emphatically to repudiate. It is often stated, it is often taken for granted, that the work and office of a Bishop, the work and office of any clergyman, is such as to incapacitate him, not merely is not such as to qualify him, but is such as to disqualify him, from acting as a judge at all. A Bishop's time ought not to be taken up, we are told, with hearing litigation: he is not to be distracted from preaching or writing letters, or confirming, by having to give his mind to abstruse or minute questionings; he has not been trained to understand the law of evidence, he has not been in the habit of examining records, or weighing probabilities, he has not been accustomed to take a sceptic or agnostic attitude in things touching the faith, and so cannot be supposed to have preserved a judgment either balanced or capable of being balanced on such points as come into controversy in these times. The same string of allegations is laid against the clergy generally, and the charge of clerical incompetency is thus made to do its work not only as against the discretion of the Bishop in the first instance, but as against the employment of ecclesiastics, either as authorities or as experts, as judges or assessors in the final resort. I need not retaliate on the lawyers, whose training in civil and criminal jurisprudence, and whose practical advance to the position of judges by forensic or parliamentary practice, seems to imply in a very small degree competency

or experience for the management of questions of the sort that troubles us in ecclesiastical matters, but I distinctly refuse to acknowledge any practical truth or necessary bearing in these assertions. If a man, by reason of his want of ability or want of experience, is unfit to exercise his common sense on such questions as this discretionary power of the Bishop involves, he is unfit to be made a Bishop; he has not indeed the qualification that fits him for being a borough magistrate. The law of evidence is no great mystery; any man fitted by other qualifications for the position in which he would have to apply it would speedily master it, and if he were unwilling to risk anything on his own command of it, could in every diocese readily obtain the assistance of a lawyer who would keep him straight—but as a matter of fact the law of evidence would not very often come into question at either end of the work. It is not every day, thank God, that litigation is attempted. It is not every clergyman who is expected to undertake the functions of a judge. It is a disgrace to a Church to have to confess that it is governed by men who have neither time nor ability to examine into hard questions; and it shall not be, so long as I can raise my voice to deny it, it shall not be said of the Church of England that she is the only religious body in the world which is obliged, by the incapacity of her rulers, to devolve the decisions of her most momentous interests on men who are uninformed and untrained for the consideration of them, having a clergy neither learned enough, nor just enough, nor careful enough to furnish faithful judges. Do not suppose that I shut my eyes to the difficulties and the impracticabilities of the matter. I am not very enthusiastic, and I do not expect very much sympathy in my small enthusiasms, but I still believe in the authority of the position in which I am placed, and trust in the guidance of Him who has placed me here, and am ready to pray for more guidance and to devote, to the utmost, my powers to the ascertaining of the truth and doing of fair justice, the Lord being my helper.

And having said so much I may very well turn to some-

thing else, but let me say this much further: there must be, in the matters of controversy of which in these days we hear so much, open questions; there must be points raised on which it is better that there should not be, even if there can be, binding decisions. The evil of controversy is not so much in the breach of uniformity as in the promotion of self-will, the damage to the proportion of faith and symmetry of practice, and chiefly in the creation of exclusive partisanship and unchristian animosities. The Bishop has a right to exercise all authority which personally or officially belongs to him—paternal, judicial, social, or political—not only to the maintenance of the law of the Church, but to the maintenance of the equity of the example of Christ, the bearing one another's burdens, the most excellent gift of charity.

Church Patronage.

Another important topic for consideration in this connexion, as involving legislative action, is the scheme of reform of the abuses of Church patronage, which had just emerged from the review of a Select Committee of the House of Lords when the Parliament was dissolved in June. The Bill so amended is the present form in which the project is before the country. I cannot, on this occasion, think it worth while to trace the bearing of the amendments, as amendments, on the original proposal, and it is unnecessary to tell you what was the chief motive in the introduction of the Bill, or what were the previous stages of discussion. The Bill as it at present stands allows the sale of an existing estate, or interest in any advowson or right of presentation, to any public patron, or to any person approved by a council of presentations constituted by the Act, under the provisions of the Act, or to any qualified parishioner, *i.e.* as defined by the Bill, the owner of lands of £200 a year within the parish. Except under this provision, and under the Chancellor's Act of 1863, all future sales are void; and, even under the Act, no sale of a portion of such interest, or sale by auction, or mortgage, is allowable except in the case of advowsons at present

appendant to manors or hereditaments, which are not affected by the prohibition of sale. The council of patronage is diocesan, or rather archidiaconal, consisting of the Bishop, the Archdeacon, a representative of the Chapter, and an elected representative of the clergy of the archdeaconry, the Chancellor of the diocese, or a legal substitute, a layman, and two laymen of the archdeaconry, chosen by a body of electors representing for this purpose the laity of the diocese, themselves chosen by the parishioners of each parish in the Easter Vestry. This council is to test the qualification of the intending purchasers of advowsons; it may not approve of any who is a dealer in livings, or who cannot declare himself free from the obligations which are known as simoniacal. Another branch of the Bill deals with procedure on presentation; directs that a disavowal shall be made on the part of the patron of any simoniacal engagement, and prescribes an enlarged and definite form of testimonial; allowing the Bishop to refuse institution of a presentee on the ground of age, insufficiency of testimonial, or a report from the council of his mental or bodily unfitness, debt likely to cause scandal, evil reputation, or particular circumstances which in the opinion of the council render the appointment unadvisable. An appeal from the Bishop to the Archbishop is allowed and regulated. Provision is made for a delay of a month between presentation and institution, during which objections may be raised by the parishioners; these objections must be of the sort which, according to the provisions of the previous clauses, would justify the Bishop in refusing institution; and these may be referred to the council of patronage. The Bishop has, however, discretion to act without regarding the decision of the council; and his right to examine the presentee, and determine his action, is not affected by the fact that such reference has been made. The communications, in such cases of objection and inquiry, are to be treated as privileged. Improved forms of declaration are provided; Roman Catholic patrons are allowed to present, the law of sequestration for debt is amended, and provision is made for cases of lunacy. Donatives are to become

presentative benefices, and resignation bonds are to be abolished.

Here is, you see, a sufficiently ample material for discussion in and out of Parliament, when the time comes at which room can be found for such discussion, and the temper comes in which, without sectarian bitterness and obstruction, and with a determinate purpose of reform, to which some modicum of private property-right may well be sacrificed, such discussion can be fairly taken. I trust that the day may come soon. Without committing myself to every item of the Bill, or pretending that it is a perfect scheme, I may say that it does strike me as a fair balance between the doctrine of property and the doctrine of trust, between the right of the laity and the right of the clergy, and between the right of the locality and that of the Church organisation as a whole. This is a matter upon which the clergy personally can exercise some influence both directly and indirectly, without, I think, increasing the unfortunate tendency which exists to regard patronage as a sort of joint stock of organisation in which shares may be claimed and promotions expected. I have heard it said that the *Clergy List* is a dangerous book. Much may be done towards raising the popular view as to rights and responsibilities as well as to the correction of painful misapprehensions.

I hardly think that it is within my province to offer now any remarks on the proposed legislation, which may or may not result from the labours of the Cathedral Commission, but, as the subject occupies a position of some importance in the eyes of Churchmen just now, I will say very briefly what I have to say. I conceive that, in the present state of Cathedral life, the safest thing would be to leave the Deans and Chapters, who are fully alive to their duties and responsibilities, to work out their mission in accordance with their history, position, and the local circumstances in which they find themselves; or at all events to go no further in the way of alteration than to enable them to get rid of the existing obstacles to improvement and development. I am entirely opposed to the idea that there should

be an inflexible rule, and unchangeable model, to which all classes of Cathedrals should be made to conform; or that even when classified together all the members of each class should be forced into uniformity. I am not at all sure that the organisation of a capitular body, of the historical character existing in the old Cathedrals, is at all necessary for the completion of the machinery of the new bishoprics; although it is desirable that all the Bishops should have the means of securing such counsel and assistance as the ideal capitular arrangement offers. Accordingly, when a Commission was asked for which might enable the Cathedrals of the New Foundation to reform their statutes, I saw no good likely to arise from the offer of one which would bring the whole body of these institutions, old and new foundations alike, under review, and risk the loss of a great deal which was both practically valuable and historically of great and living interest. The institution of a Cathedral Committee of the Privy Council, which has been proposed by the Commission, does not recommend itself to me, either in reference to the theory of the thing, or in reference to the working of such Committees, which seems to me to offer too great openings for unnecessary and over-tentative changes. I do not like the theory which practically eliminates the authority of the Bishop from his Cathedral; and I do not like the working of a system that offers a premium to impatience and disunion. There is no elasticity in the working of such a scheme, and it seems to me to unite the characteristics of making reform difficult and agitation easy. The particular statutes drawn for our own Cathedral I do not approve; they seem to me to make obligatory by law matters which might easily be dealt with by Chapter order, and they fetter the action of the Bishop in his administration of patronage in a way which is arbitrary and unwise. I do not suppose, however, that, during my episcopate, any such provisions would be enforced. As to the whole question, I fully believe that an Act something like the statute of Anne, on which the legal obligation of the New Foundation Cathedral Statutes rests at present, an Act which would enable the Chapters to

enforce, under the view of their Visitor, the statutes already valid, and provide for the execution of Chapter orders for the future, was all that was requisite. The wider questions, which concern the future of our Cathedral system, and that more through incorporation into the life of the diocese and of the Church, which is already being worked out by industrious labour and careful study—how to make everything connected with it perfect in order, administration, and extension of usefulness—were, I doubt not, present to the minds of the Commissioners, but do not on the surface receive much illustration, either from the report or from the projected statutes. As I am not now holding a Visitation of our Cathedral, a matter which I may undertake next year, if I live, I will not now comment on the more speculative and less authoritative schemes of Cathedral reform which are propounded, or likely to be propounded, in the present state of ecclesiastical opinion.

As to these and all the like matters, which, second to the things spiritual, are still so closely bound up with them as matters of daily and hourly responsibility before God and man as to be serious elements of our life here, I commend myself to your prayers and sympathy.

Visitation Questions.

In drawing up the paper of questions to be addressed to the clergy, in preparation for the Visitation, I have followed almost exactly the plan of my predecessor.

From the answers to the tenth question I learn that in the choice of hymn-book, there is a very large consensus for the use of the best and most careful compilations—no very great diversity of usage—only three different manuals being to any considerable extent employed, in spite of the variety of local habits and musical developments. Remembering, as I do, the days when every considerable congregation had its own collection, and the only large consensus was in favour of the dullest and most unintelligible hymns, I am inclined to think this a good sign of improvement and of increasing interest and realisation of unity in the worship of the congregations.

Evening Communion.

I now come to the questions touching the celebration of the Holy Communion. I should be shirking what I believe to be my duty if I were not to say that I am sorry to find the practice of evening Communion still retained in so many parishes. When I say this, you must not understand that I am unconscious of, or that I shut my eyes to, the difficulty of the subject : the difficulties which the practice is intended to meet, and the difficulties of laying it aside when and where it has been once adopted. I am not likely to forget that, in many places, it was originally introduced in consequence of a growing realisation of the sacramental system, and in the simple and earnest belief that it was better to sacrifice a subordinate matter of ecclesiastical order than to run the risk of practically depriving those who could not attend morning service of one of the institutions which we are taught to regard as generally necessary to salvation. I can understand the obstacle to abolishing evening Communion which is to be found in the fact that by this time, unhappily, the subject has come to be regarded as bound up with party politics in ecclesiastical matters. I can, moreover, make considerable allowances for the change which altered manners, altered times of rising, Sunday meals, and Sunday services, make in the domestic habits, which are matters now of necessity rather than convenience. But with all these allowances I cannot overcome my aversion to a practice which seems to me both lazy and inconsistent with that amount of exertion and respectful preparation which the reception of the Holy Sacrament demands. As to the main arguments on the subject, I am heartily at one with my venerated predecessor, whose reasons for disapproval are on record in the memories of most of you. I am not disposed to set forth injunctions which will not be obeyed, or to offer recommendations which will not be adopted; neither am I going to censure those clergymen whose position and exigencies seem to themselves a justification for continuing the practice I speak of. But I must distinctly

say that any clergyman who shall hereafter introduce evening Communion into his church will do it in direct opposition to the deliberate opinion which I have expressed now as to its fitness or expediency. The true way of meeting the difficulty is to be found in increasing the number of celebrations at the regular hours, in urging on the heads of families their duty of making such arrangements as will enable all the confirmed inmates of their houses to communicate from time to time, and, in general, by such teaching as will exhibit the true importance of the Sacrament, the duty and privilege, the blessing, and the obligation of obeying the Saviour's command and appropriating the fulfilment of His promise.

Words of Administration.

The last clause of the fifteenth question is not satisfactorily answered. The words of administration are clearly, both on the face of the rubric and on the evidence of the history of the circumstances which gave the rubric its present form, intended and directed to be addressed to each communicant: not to twos or threes, or sets, at a time. It is quite possible that the altered circumstances of the Church might now admit of some relaxation of this rule, but it has not been relaxed; and, in common with other portions of the Communion Service, which add unnecessarily to the length of our present composite morning offices, cannot be dispensed with either by episcopal or individual discretion.

Ceremonial.

I would call the attention of the clergy in this connexion to a further generalisation which they must take in good part. I am, both by constitution and by mature conviction, strongly indisposed to mere mechanical uniformity in divine worship: but I am most anxious that everything should be done, especially in this most solemn ordinance, in a way that shall express, and work, sympathy, unity in spirit and heart. I know that there are great and permissible variations in the ceremonial which belongs

to it. The simplest and plainest celebration may be full of reverence and devotion; carelessness and perfunctoriness may intrude into the most elaborate and ornate ritual. It would be a great blessing if the differences of practice could be leavened with the same penetrating and absorbing spirit, drawing hearts together even when the fashion of the ceremonial varied. It would be well that the variations themselves could be minimised, so as not to distract attention where hearts and minds and souls should be concentrated; so as not to invite criticism, or to provoke antipathy in the midst of the ordinance of peace. Let us bear one another's burdens; bear one another's variations, and even eccentricities; but for the sake of Truth, and Love, and the God who is with us, let us do our best to maintain the reality and reverence that belongs to the Holiest of the Holy Mysteries.

Schools.

The questions numbered 17 to 23 relate to schools, and the answers call for no very specialised review now. It is welcome news that the education of the people is improving; it is very satisfactory to find that board schools are not increasing, and that voluntary effort has not yet broken down under the heavy strain that seems each year to make it less voluntary or even to prevent it from being truly spontaneous. But the side of the question that is present to my mind on this occasion is chiefly this: how far is the Church, how far are the clergy, discharging the duty, which is only modified, by no means taken out of their hands, by the present system of public elementary education? The limitation of the religious instruction given in our schools throws upon us a stricter form of obligation—a concentration of religious teaching, and the recourse to new machinery in substitution for that which is no longer so available as it used to be in the day school. The revival of catechising in Church, the development of Sunday-schools, the institution of communicant, Bible, and adult classes, and the working on the lines of Confirmation preparation, are present to

your minds as to mine. But I cannot help expressing a wish that the clergy would make a special effort to economise and utilise every opportunity they have of visiting the schools regularly, and likewise of instructing the pupil teachers. If the opportunities of direct religious instruction in the day school are limited, we ought to do our best to prevent that limitation from becoming mischievous—we must do our best to secure that all the teaching in our schools is given in a religious spirit, and with some realisation of the religious character of all duty and all knowledge. If the education of the people is not to be left at a standstill, it will not long continue to satisfy itself with what we call elementary instruction; there must be progress and incorporation of new subjects, and specialisation as well: and all such progress is for the best—for all knowledge, in the process and as a result of the acquisition, leads men to higher regions of thought and nearer approaches to truth. In religious teaching, and not merely in that, but in the religious teaching of all subjects, it is the duty of the clergy to try to lead on the teachers of the next generation to more refined and judicial culture, to a true appreciation of the preciousness and proportion of real knowledge. Perhaps you think that I have placed the performance of a duty, which some find irksome and which at the best involves some drudgery, a thought too high. But I adhere to it still: you must individualise your educational work, as you would every other department of your pastoral work. Sermons are useless without parochial visiting and sympathetic personal intercourse. The children in the schools, the pupil teachers in their preparation for higher work, must be made to see that they are, each one in his individuality, a care and study to those who are set to work for them in the Lord, to whom each one is as dear, and ought to know by experience that he is as dear, and as distinctly an object of care, as if he were the only one to whom the parish priest, following his Lord, brought the knowledge of the word of life and truth.

I must pass over the intermediate questions, the answers

to which are subject to local variations and turn on particular circumstances which come before us on other occasions, and go at once to the thirtieth question: What are the chief hindrances to the success of your pastoral labours?

Pastoral Work.

This is a very wide question, and it has received a wide variety of answers. Some of these it was, I think, scarcely intended to elicit; for I conceive that the object of putting the question was to draw out a representation of the difficulties which the Bishop's advice or influence would be likely to counteract. It does, however, give the clergy the opportunity of confessing their own insufficiency, poverty, weariness, self-distrust, and sense of inadequateness, as well as of proclaiming that their struggle is against the evil of corrupt humanity in their flocks and the influences to which they are subject. Those of the clergy who tell me that immorality, intemperance, impurity, ignorance, are hindrances to their success, do little more than tell me that they have no special hindrances; for it is against such evils that, in the first instance, they have undertaken to struggle. Some few mention more distinct sorts of difficulties—the retention of the pew system; the want of help and countenance from the resident gentry of their neighbourhoods; the absence of such social influence altogether, and of the example in the way of culture, good manners, and gentle kindly feeling, which might make such an element very precious in the work of drawing men's hearts together; the mischiefs which have arisen from past neglect, non-residence, bad clergymen, and bad traditions in former times; the terrible and crying offence of Sunday labour, not only in the great manufacturing districts, but in the agricultural, and especially in the cheese-making parts of Cheshire; and in the system of Sunday excursion trains, which is making a wilderness and desert (religiously speaking) of whole villages in the diocese that border on the industrial districts; scattered populations, remoteness of church from people, local

grounds of offence, prejudices of religious partisanship, aversion to distinct Church principles, sectarian feeling and political animosities.

It is difficult to cull, from such a garden full of weeds, those which are capable of special treatment. Some of the evils noted are altogether out of our reach. We cannot force residence or the duty of residence on the landlords; we cannot build a church or even a mission room for every group of cottages; we cannot stem the tide of the Sunday excursion trains, or even attempt to provide a special remedy in the way of counter attraction or excitement. At the outside we can only do our best to raise the tone of the public mind on this as on the other points; all are matters for serious thought. The peculiar openings for immoral behaviour in connection with the special agricultural industry of Cheshire are, as has been proved by one at least of our most honoured brethren, capable of thorough reform: the reformation of manners in one parish, produced by a steady and high-principled remonstrance with the employers of labour, has been very signal. It is surely to be believed that the continuance of evil and degrading customs is in many cases due to the influence of habit and to the shortsightedness that long-continued abuses produce, which may be overcome by an honest and frank, unpretentious, courageous, and considerate representation of the evil.

Sunday.

The more one thinks of the question of Sunday observance, the more important and the more difficult the issues seem that result from the present condition of things. Sunday is a day of rest—Sunday is a day of devotion—of rest sanctified for and by devotion. The continuity of labour, whether it be agricultural work, or chemical work, or iron and steel work, or the work that is involved in the excursion trains, is alike a breach in the law of rest and in the law of devotion. The giving of the day of rest to the greedy seeking after change and excitement, such as the excursion system seems to foster, is a

serious breach in the law that should sanctify all the recreation of the day. The results of wasted and mis-spent Sundays, in the demoralisation of our people, are well known, sadly well known—the increase of drunkenness, the beginning of vice, sin, and crime, arising from Sunday idleness and wantonness, are matters of the commonest experience. On the other hand, people cannot be forced into church, and, if they were, their act would not be devotion. They cannot and ought not to be attracted by counter excitement which would end in certain reaction. It is unkind and unwise to think of debarring them from the refreshment and diversion of a short run into the country on the only day of the week that can be appropriated in that way, and we have no right, no order, to infringe their liberty in doing so. And again, we are to some extent bound by a tradition of strictness for which we are not accountable, and which can never have been thoroughly enforced; a tradition which has become, with certain classes of people, the most prominent and conscious sign of religious profession, and a very important part of the discipline which guides their moral conduct. And this tradition fetters the hands of those who do believe that something might be done for the relief of an oppressing evil. We know of the efforts made to open libraries and picture-galleries and public gardens on Sundays—just as we know of the attempts to close public-houses on Sundays. Many of us feel that, except so far as the opening of such institutions as libraries and galleries on Sunday involves Sunday labour, the measure is open to little or no charge of irreligion or disregard for the holy day. I know of very few good people who, when they are abroad, abstain from visiting picture-galleries on Sundays, or from appearing in other resorts where they would not show themselves at home, even if they had time and inclination—and why? Simply because, by breaking the strict traditional custom of English opinion, they would be breaking down a barrier which keeps out incompletely, but to a certain extent efficiently, a great deal of public mischief; they would be seeming to countenance a

great deal of defiance to God's law and public decency of conduct.

I can but state the difficulty—the extreme difficulty that has hitherto baffled the efforts of humanitarians and philanthropists as well as of clergymen. That by God's blessing and in good time a way may be found out of the perplexity, I do not doubt. The growth of education ought to result in a refinement which will put vulgar excitement out of the list of things desirable; a better knowledge of the true force of Sunday obligation will prevent the tension of the outward rules of observance; and possibly, with an enlarged sense of liberty, there will be a higher sense of the blessings of Sunday rest. But, for ourselves and for our own sense of responsibility, we can put our trust in no such contingencies, no such hopes of a future that we shall not live to see, and in consideration of which our own work cannot be estimated. We must do the best we can with the means that are within our reach: using all influence we have or can get to prevail on employers to minimise the necessary labours of their workpeople, and on the people themselves to give a portion of their time of rest to the welfare of their souls and the service of their Maker. We must try to engage them, old and young, so far as we can, in the interest of Church and school, giving them their place and portion: we must try to enter into their weekday interests and lead them on to the sanctification of the week by the Sunday. We must bear in mind that, as "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," so with the Sunday tradition of English religion: men are not to be driven to the public-house because they will not be driven into church. After all that I have said, you may justly say, it is hard to be put off with generalities. You know as well as I, many of you by sadder experience, far better than I can pretend to see or to feel, the fatal mischief of the existing state of things. Your work is that which lies before your feet, the rescuing of one child here, another there; the sanctification of one household here and another there; the drawing of one man, woman, or child, one

definite man, woman, and child on one definite Sunday to church and away from the public-house—the turning of one sinner at a time from the error of his ways. May He who can, take this stumbling-block from before us shortly, and give us strength to overcome the evil with good.

Indifference.

Of all the hindrances to the success of the pastoral labours of the clergy, the one which is most prominent in the answers to the thirtieth question on the Visitation papers is *indifference*—a wide and most unhappily suggestive term, which, indeed, covers many causes of trouble and misgiving. Here is a matter on which every parish priest has need to begin the series of investigations and reforms in his own conscience and on his knees before God. Have I no evil root of indifference in myself? Have I prayed for my people as I ought? Have I prayed—I will not say enough—for God, who is pleased in such wonderful ways to use the agency of mankind, even in intercession for the blessings which He is most desirous to bestow, does not measure the exigency by the sufficiency of our prayers,—but have I prayed really and intelligently and with reference to individual cases? Have I shown myself so mindful of, and so sympathetic with, my people, that they have a reasonable right to believe that I am in earnest? Have I got them to trust me in other matters as well as spiritual ones, knowing, as I must do, that where their treasure is there is their heart, and I must have their heart in guidance if I am to help them to set it on the true Treasure? I do not say that he is a happy man who can answer these questions in the affirmative; for, if any can, he must have too many burdens to bear to let him have much happiness in the way of rest from misgiving; but, if any can, I am pretty sure that he will not find indifference to his ministrations much of an obstacle. Besides taking thought, and earnest prayer, and a patient heart, and a ready willingness to speak the word, as, in all due tact, courage, and simplicity, you see it to be

needed, we want steady and unflinching adherence to the definite duties of our service: orderly and reverent worship—nothing strikes the really indifferent so much as the regular devotion, the punctual and systematic observance of religious ordinances, as a real part of the discipline of a pure, active, and sympathetic life. We want a careful, regular, and orderly observance of all Church work, all Church services and opportunities for doing good. Let your people see that you value daily prayers for yourself, and that you can deny yourself something for the sake of them: let them see you regular in the school, regular in visitation, taking pains and showing that you are ready to take pains more and more, because you love your work and honour it, doing it unto the Lord and not merely to them. Give careful attention to preaching—I mean real preaching—and by real preaching I mean, not the utterance of sensational paragraphs, however eloquent, which might be preached in Kamtschatka with as much truth and as little appropriateness as in Cheshire, but distinct utterances with intended meaning and application to the circumstances of the day, place, and congregation—sermons that have been studied and written beforehand, if not with pen and ink, on the tables of the heart and brain. Judge yourselves how far the neglect or perfunctory performance of such duties may account for indifference.

But, granting all this, allowing all that can be allowed for our own shortcomings and the effect which they have in encouraging or producing indifference in our people, there is, no doubt, much indifference in the air, and that rather aggravated and emphasised by the existence of a certain emotionalism and sensationalism in religious work, ostensibly intended to counteract it. It may be that the class which is likely to be affected by emotionalism and sensationalism is different from that which is chargeable with indifference, but it cannot be denied that the two mischiefs play into each other's hands. One class is disgusted with sensationalism, another is provoked by indifference—the sensational justifies the indifferent in his

indifference, the indifference justifies the sensational on his appeals to excitement.

The indifference you complain of may, however, be of two kinds, either an indifference to religion altogether, or an indifference to the religious teaching of our own Church, which, however it may to us mean the whole of the best religious teaching, does not wear the same aspect to all, owing largely to the fact that for long years it has been misrepresented, and, where represented at all, not always represented in a wise way.

Mission Agencies.

A word on each. The obvious and natural remedy for indifference to all religious life, where that indifference has been proof against the earnest work, prayer, sympathy, and example of a devout pastor, is the calling in of a mission or revival agency, such as we have often seen employed with good effect in past years. For the employment of this agency we have, I think, sufficient means, if we can only duly determine the moment and method of application. We have, in the Church of England Parochial Mission Society, an agency that we call in by invitation for a time; we have, in the Church Army, an organisation of which we may avail ourselves for the purpose of enlisting, directing, and maintaining continuous efforts to awaken real life in the classes whose habits of thought and action lay them open to the temptations of sensationalism, from which, by the use of means to which they are amenable, we want to rescue them and direct their too excitable feelings into the right channels. I have myself become a patron of both these bodies, not by any means in the idea that I was to be committed to all their proceedings, but because I see the need that there is for such organisation, and because I should like to exercise some influence in the determination where and how the organisation in question should be called in. There are parishes in which the too frequent use of missions would result in the weakening of the sense of pastoral responsibility, and in the interposition of an extraneous influence between the minister and his people;

there are parishes where the introduction of a Church Army might lead to anything but harmonious and concentrated action. On the other hand, there are parishes which absolutely need frequent missions, and where anything like a Church Army would produce some measure at least of awakening. But all should be done with some reference to the authority and experience which a real Bishop is expected to possess; and to the due proportion and occasion for the use of means for which it may be well to have more mature consideration than the parish priest by himself can afford to give. For the temptation to impatience, weariness, and the tentative use of occasional new expedients is very strong to the overworked and over-excited labourer. And it may often happen that the short and sharp work of a mission is unwisely preferred to the steady and seemingly unremunerative drudgery of unappreciated service. I speak as to wise men, and I earnestly hope that every clergyman who wishes to adopt either of these two methods will in good time make his wishes known to me. In the case of the first plan it is his canonical duty so to do, for no clergyman, however able and excellent a missionary he may be, can lawfully exercise his gifts in the churches of the diocese without my permission or licence; and, although the other scheme, that of Church Armies, is not so directly subject to me, I have a right, I think—I feel that my own interest in your work, if nothing else, gives me a right—to be consulted. It is in the idea that, by joint action, and by attempting to utilise such missionary and organising ability as we possess in the diocese, we might do this work more effectually than it has been done, that I have had drawn up, by the kindness of a friend who takes great interest in the matter, the scheme of a Diocesan Society of Local Missions; this I have notified through the rural deans to the clergy, but its own modesty, I fear, has insufficiently recommended it to your active sympathies.

Whilst I advise caution in the application of these mission agencies, and would urge that they should not be applied, as indeed they cannot be applied safely or effec-

tively, until the whole of the true and regular pastoral system has been conscientiously carried into execution, in regular services, teachings, and visitation, I must add a further caution, that the work of a mission will be thrown away, may be absolutely harmful, unless it is followed up by a permanent system of work. Where a parish is already well visited, a successful mission ought to pour in new blood and nerve into the existing machinery of services, classes, guilds, and the like: where it involves the creation of new modes, increase of services, additional societies, classes, and the like, the preparation for such development of work must be part of the general preparation for the mission.

Where the indifference complained of is an indifference to the distinctive teachings of the Church of England, not accompanied by any hostility or unjustifiable competition on the part of Nonconformist communities, the natural remedy seems to be the steady teaching of Church principles in Church, in the schools of the Church, and by lectures. To the true and intelligent Churchman the principles of the Church of England are the principles of true religion, her discipline the discipline of religion, and her doctrines the doctrines of Christ: but this does not involve the constant thrusting forward in Church of her distinctive statements of practical religion, as the only subject of preaching, or of her special sanction as the only or chief warrant of authority. In the present state of popular intelligence it is of very little use to enforce the fulfilment of Christian duty by special ecclesiastical ratiocination; such a plan suggests as well as embitters prejudice, and we may be justifiably reminded that there are other articles in the Creed, which, in due proportion, demand even more careful exposition than that of the Holy Catholic Church. But, although I advise you not to be always harping on the Church string, I must qualify that advice by reminding you that your teaching must always be in accord with it, and that honesty as well as faithful adherence to the truths you hold, honesty, sincerity, loyalty, and true liberality, demand that you

should give it its proper place and its distinct proportionate recognition: special, constructive, and uncontroversial.

Church Doctrine.

Church doctrine must be taught in the pulpit. The Church of England has a history which ought to form part of the teaching in all schools of the children of the Church, and the same teaching is an integral portion of our general scheme of Church defence. But, as a means of kindling interest as a counteraction to popular indifference, I can only recommend the circulation of good books, and the diffusion by means of courses of lectures, such as are common enough in the regions of secular culture, of information on the history of the Church of England, her relations to the Universal Church, the great things that she has done and suffered, the continuity of her life, and the debt that England owes to her; the great things indeed that her Lord has done for her and the great work that He has set her. I trust that some part of the machinery which I have suggested for the mission work, the employment of the well-qualified men that we have in our own diocese to do such work, may be used with good effect. There must, however, be some scheme for co-operative teaching, or we shall be at the mercy of the old text-books, and run a risk of sacrificing the object we have in view to matters of personal and pictorial interest. We want to have Church history taught simply and continuously and rid of party colourings; we do not want Puritanism or ceremonialism made into standards of spiritual life, or political programmes advocated as necessarily connected with religious liberty or the realisation of Church vitality. But the subject is too wide to be treated at any great length here and now.

Nonconformity.

It does, however, connect itself closely with another of the hindrances to pastoral work which occupies a very important place in the answers of the clergy, under the

term *Nonconformity*, *Dissent*, *competition of other religious bodies*, and the like. Religious indifference has a twofold relation to this subject: it may be pleaded either that the differences between the Church of England and the competing communities are so small and unintelligible, and have so little to do with the practice of virtue and the good of society, that it is a mistake to recognise them, true wisdom to ignore them; or it may be pleaded that, on the other hand, they are so deep and searching that it is of little use attempting to choose between them, and safer to stand aloof from the whole region of life in which such quarrels and struggles are being carried on. The result is in the former case indifference to the Church, in the latter indifference to religion altogether. The practical working of the first sort of indifference is seen in attempts made, with the best intentions, at co-operation with Nonconformists for religious as well as social and philanthropic designs—and this is a matter on which, delicate as it may seem, it yet is my duty to speak distinctly. Can we really, wisely and practically, combine with the competing communities for common religious services, mission work, or education? The initial question is, How and why are they Nonconformists, how and why are they competing communities? The answer, Simply because they as communities hold some points so important as to outweigh the advantages of communion with the Church. They object to something that we have not surrendered, or they maintain something that we have not enforced or even have forbidden, and for that reason disclaim communion with us. But it is said we may have co-operation if we will waive the points of difference. In the first place, this waiving of the points of difference implies that we of the Church of England are less attached to our faith than they are to theirs. We enter, therefore, into the combination under an avowed admission that we maintain, as necessary terms of communion, points which we do not believe to be necessary, whilst the competing communities enter it with full freedom to ignore doctrines and practices which we profess to regard as intrinsically a part of our system.

The whole balance of earnestness and efficiency thus seems, and really is so far as this is concerned, on the side of the Nonconformists: they can say, You set up a standard to which you do not adhere; we adhere to our programme, and, so far as the negative side of it is concerned, you are self-condemned. In the second place, the waiving of points of difference implies that there is a residuum of common truth and practical teaching on which all Christian bodies may unite; but it also implies that the points of difference are not, in the actual working of the religious teaching, intrinsically and essentially, in the minds of the workers, a part of the religious working itself. The Holy Catholic Church is the subject of one article of the Creed: the order and discipline of the Church, her doctrinal and sacramental system, are surely a part of her essential working: and to admit these in their proper proportion and place in teaching, is to be guilty of a serious laches, a want of courage, of honesty, and of that practical wisdom which is wiser than any temporising, and more effective than any finesse, diplomacy, or other form of cunning craftiness. It will be said that the inculcation of temperance, soberness, and chastity, the institution therefore, of temperance and purity societies; street preachings for the purpose, designs of houses of refuge, shelter, and mercy, are works which can be set on foot without accentuation of points of difference: but against this must be set the two objections—the first that if temperance, soberness, and chastity are to be inculcated without the inculcation of the only motive on which the reform can really be based—repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus—the work and its fulfilment must go without their main-spring, and the result must be simply a social reform which, however desirable in itself, should not be thus connected with religious teaching: that is, temperance, soberness, and chastity, inculcated with religious sanctions, cannot be separated from doctrinal teachings; inculcated without religious sanctions, they are not a matter for religious co-operation, but for the employment of secular agencies and arguments of temporal expediency. Let each

religious community teach temperance by its own arguments, but let them not reduce religious teaching to a secular level by the association of elements destructive of one another.

And the second objection is this, that the moment the work has ceased to be one of mere awakening, and become one in which discipline is needed, joint working will be found impossible. You cannot, by the work of joint committees of Churchmen and Nonconformists, carry on an institution in which discipline, rule, and administration shall be effective. The merest questions of prayers, authoritative teaching, wholesome discipline, even forms of worship, will divide opinions in such a body, and such division of opinion can only end in the adoption of rules and methods which will content no party, and depend even for perfunctory fulfilment on those who have no heart in the work.

Now I say this without prejudice: I fully believe that a Roman Catholic or Nonconformist society may inculcate temperance, soberness, and chastity, on its own principles and by its own discipline, thoroughly well and efficiently; and I certainly believe that the ultimate principle on which both would inculcate them, the principle of faith, repentance, and obedience, would be the same in all such teachings; but it would be otherwise in co-operation, where the practical administration would necessarily fall into the hands of those who had the fewest definite principles of working, *i.e.* into the hands of those who would practically ignore or actually contradict the theories and practices of the others. In saying this, again, I am not excluding many sorts of direct co-operation, such as is the case with the defence of religious education, the maintenance of hospitals, the work of the Bible Society, and in general any plans of philanthropy and common defensive action into which the controversies of doctrine and discipline do not enter. The lesson of the educational history of the last twenty years would furnish some important further illustrations of this; but I must pass on.

Religious Competition.

The active hostility of Nonconformist bodies is quite another point, and it is unfortunately complicated with the influence of political animosities of a very repulsive and dangerous character: repulsive, because these animosities allow the use of means and weapons that are very unworthy of religion under whatever form it is veiled; and dangerous, because they threaten the very fabric of society both here and abroad. False accusations against classes and against individuals as representing classes, the reiteration of disproved statements, and of unproved charges, as recognised truths; the attempts to sow the seeds of mistrust and alienation between classes of men who ought to be all at one, are weapons of which no religious man will defend the use; and the use of them, therefore, on whatever side they are used, must be laid to the charge of the unprincipled or ignorant politicians who see no harm in sacrificing the religious interest and character of their own party to the momentary gain of the particular end. I do not hesitate to say that, socially, the great mischief of the religious competition I speak of lies in its connection with political struggles. But setting aside that, what is the state of things of which we complain? The competition involves a waste of energy, the stimulating of personal and social jealousies, the habitual viewing of the rival organisation through a distorting medium; struggles for particular families, involution in personal quarrels, and the complication of religious difference with every species of petty disagreements — worse than this — positive attempts to thwart good work; school boards adopted rather than leave the education of the poor under the influence of the clergy; the use of authorised forms forbidden lest any Church influence should be admitted; the institution of rival classes for instruction lest the clergy should get hold of the people; the erection of rival places of worship where they are not needed; the absolute ignoring of the work of the clergy, as if the whole field which they occupy were, by the very fact of their occupation, crying aloud for missionary agency of a purer kind; and this coupled with

a determined effort to lay to the charge of the clergy the existence of the very abuses which they are devoting themselves to counteract. And again, the proselytising work, scarcely justifiable on the most distinctly Dissenting principles, which makes it a great object to detach men, women, and children from the form of religion in which they were educated, shaking thereby the very existence of such religious feelings and sympathies as are still in them, and supplying their place with those purely sectarian antipathies which are, whatever else they may be, absolutely barren and unfruitful religiously.

No one can contemplate this state of things with a complete judicial calmness, and yet we must allow what is to be said on the other side. Human nature is human nature, and the motives of our highest actions are not always unmixed. If one sectarian deems his neighbour committed to deadly error, it is his duty as well as his right to attempt his conversion ; and if he regards a rival institution, like the Church of England, as doing more harm than good, he is bound to insist so far as he can on its abolition. The moral evil of schism, in its contempt for authority, its self-will and perversion of truth, is evaporated or precipitated in the first generation ; and a sect that is two generations old acts, in its struggle for influence, on principles analogous to, if not identical with, those which the Church of England, were it not for her belief in her own character as the historical presentment of the Church of God to England, would be seen to act upon in the same strife ; and, even then, on their own principles of Church communion and on their own theory of the interpretation of the article of the Creed, it is hard to blame them. But it is one thing to weigh the excuses and to formulate the justification of the conduct and position of our opponents, and quite another to surrender our own strongholds.

We cannot, then, undo, we cannot ignore, we cannot undervalue, we cannot act as ignoring or undervaluing, the mischief of this competition. What can we do without widening the rift between classes and wasting our force

and means in perpetuating quarrels? I wish, indeed, that I could tell you an easy approach to the most excellent way. I cannot tell you to despise attacks that are made on the faith as well as on you. I cannot tell you to shut your eyes against hostility which seems sleepless and unwearied. I cannot tell you to spend your time in refuting calumnies which are repeated all the more wilfully after each refutation, or to answer charges which will gain the more acceptance from your very willingness to debate them. But I can call to your mind the apostolic injunction, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good"; prove your own way to be the better way by living up to it and helping your people to do the same; keep your hands from the weapons that are used against you; do not answer reproach with reproach, but with careful correction of that which has laid you open to it; let your work be done in the best way, with more faith and energy and prayer and watchfulness, not that it may beat the work of the rival community, but because it is done unto the Lord, in the belief that it is His work, and because no work can be worthy even of the love and loyalty that you bear to Him and His Church which is not done with all the heart and mind and soul and strength. And be not ashamed or dismayed if your competitors work in the same spirit, even if their work runs counter to yours; there is One that seeketh and judgeth, and it will be no loss to you if they also are approved in His good time.

Church Reform.

I now come to a matter which is of very great importance, both speculatively and practically; a subject, too, which can only be treated, on an occasion like this, with much caution and very careful regard to persons and schools of opinion, but which also that very need of caution makes it most necessary to discuss at some length. I mean the projects for Church reform which were put before us from various sides during the last winter. These projects were promulgated at the close of the elections of 1885, and, no

doubt, the moment chosen for the issuing of them was determined by the alarm of schemes of Disestablishment which was created before the elections, and which for the moment was supposed to be quieted by the declaration of some of our political leaders that no such projects should be brought forward during the ensuing Parliament. After the elections were over, and the immediate urgency of the alarm had subsided, it was thought proper by several bodies of men, actuated by, no doubt, the best motives, to set out certain principles of reform, by which some of the reasons alleged in favour of Disestablishment might be got rid of, and by which also, taking advantage of the general awakening of interest on the subject, the rulers of the Church might find opportunity of remedying particular evils and making distinct steps of progress. I will mention three of these projects in the order of their appearing, and then, extracting from them the several points which require abstract treatment, dismiss the personalities concerned in the question.

The first of these proceeded from a number of leading men in the University of Cambridge, and was published the first week in December. It was addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops, and, urging the injury done by the postponement of reforms, together with the opportunity afforded by the revival of public interest, specified three evils that need prompt correction—the sale of patronage, the anomalies in the distribution of Church revenues, and the difficulty of dealing with criminous and incompetent clerks. To secure these and other reforms, it very strongly urged the need of a more complete development of the constitution and government of the Church, central, diocesan, and parochial, and especially the admission of laymen of all classes, who are *bona fide* Churchmen, to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs. In close juxtaposition with this document there appeared a much longer paper, treating more argumentatively on the relations of Church and State as they are at present, and protesting against the idea of the disruption of the union, and against Disestablishment and Disendowment as involved in

the disruption. This paper was issued, avowedly by members of the Liberal party in politics, and includes several statements of principle and opinion on which I cannot now enter, although, for the most part, I think that I may say that I agree with them: the point of connexion, however, with the first address is this: the statement that the Church suffers both in efficiency and in popular estimation by the difficulties which impede the rectification of various chronic abuses without fresh legislation: but that above all it suffers by the practical exclusion of its laity from definite powers and responsibilities. To meet that evil it is proposed that facilities should be given to the Church for virtually independent administration and legislation, which might be done if lay Churchmen were invested with a large measure of responsibility and power in its local and general government. This statement of the evil and the proposed remedy may be regarded, I suppose, as an expansion of the last point urged in the shorter address. Against the two, *seperatim et conjunctim*, the chief points to be alleged are the extreme vagueness of the method of remedy proposed, and the extreme inopportuneness of the time chosen for proposing a remedy which, according to the immediate conditions of the moment at which it was attempted, might take the form of a mere bureaucratic organisation, a shuffle of party expedients and class prejudices, or such a fundamental and radical revolution in the constitution of the Church of England as would destroy its Catholic and historical character conceivably beyond the possibility of restoration. There is an amount of ingenuous temerity in the proposal itself which ought not to prejudice us against it as a *bona fide* suggestion, but which does certainly carry with it grounds for suspicion that the signatories had imperfectly realised the difficulties of dealing with the constitution of a body which claims the character of a historical and living portion of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The second document, to which we must now look, followed the Cambridge address after the interval of about a week, and was signed by clergy only. The names

attached to it cannot be classed as belonging to any definite party, and the language of the address itself is so moderate in tone as to show that it must have been drawn up with a view to the utmost comprehension. This memorial urges five points in which reform is desired, and on which the signers undertake to advise the Archbishops, giving indeed their general adhesion to proposals, on some of the subjects noted, which, it was understood, had been supported by the Archbishops themselves. The first point is the giving to the laity, by means of parochial councils and otherwise, a clearly defined share in the administration of Church affairs; the second is the reform of Church patronage, including the proposal that no one shall be appointed to a living without previous consultation with the parishioners or their representatives; the third, the provision of security against ministerial inefficiency; the fourth, the reduction of anomalies in the present distribution of revenue; and the fifth, such a relaxation in the Act of Uniformity as would make it lawful to vary the services held in our churches according to the needs and circumstances of the population in different parishes and districts. Of this programme it is enough to say that it has some advantage in point of definiteness over the Cambridge address, that it recognises more clearly the efforts which have been made of late years to arrest the evils for which further remedial measures are desired, and that it does implicitly carry with it a recognition that the national Church is something more than the mere association or organisation for the maintenance of the form of religion which recommends itself from time to time to the convictions of the majority.

The third manifesto was issued early in January, and is signed by ministers of the Nonconformist communities as well as by clergymen of the Church. It begins with the statement that three centuries ago the Church of England was reformed to suit the needs of those times; that a fresh reformation must take place to suit present needs; that Disestablishment and Disendowment involve difficulties and mischiefs which ought not to be incurred except in the last

resort; and that therefore the Church ought to be so reformed as to become once more, in fact as well as in name, the Church of the nation. That, in view of this great object, the endowments of the Church ought to remain sacred to religious uses; the people to have a voice in the election of its ministers, in the control of its funds, and in the arrangement of its services; and the basis of the Church to be so enlarged as to include, as far as possible, the entire Christian thought and life of the nation. The Church of England would thus be nationalised, whilst its ancient parochial organisation would be preserved for promoting what all Churches alike aim at, the spread of true religion among the people. Among the clergymen who have signed this paper appear several who signed also the second address to the Archbishops, and whose names, appended to such a document, must, I think, have slightly astonished some of those who had joined them in the former address, whilst the fact that they signed the third must be allowed to explain the sense in which they had signed the second. So far forth, the appearance of the names in the third paper damages the importance of the second; a consensus so vague as to be compatible with both expressions of opinion, losing a great deal of its value, and considerably impairing the claim, which through it the address to the Bishops may make, to be a fairly representative memorial. The idea of a Church organisation, offered in the third paper, difficult as it may be of realisation, is definite enough, and cannot be logically reconciled with the idea which I have, inferentially, perhaps with too much confidence, allowed to be discoverable in the second. Anyhow, I am confident that a very large proportion of those who signed the second address signed it with a conviction as to the nature of a Church absolutely incompatible with that which is formulated in the third, and which yet some of their co-signatories have set their hands to. I am sorry if this remark seems to verge on personality, but it is really important in its bearing on the weight to be assigned to either paper. Whilst I am on this point, let me say how thankful I am

that so few, if any, of the Cheshire clergy have signed any document of the kind.

I will offer now a very few remarks on the several points urged in these memorials. Those points are, to put them briefly, patronage, discipline, revenue, lay-help and control as exemplified in the plan of parochial councils, the relaxation of the Act of Uniformity, and the scheme of comprehension, if it may be so called, which is described as the extension of the basis of the Church.

Church Patronage.

I. The question of patronage includes three subordinate points: (*a*) The abuse of the traffic; (*b*) the intrusion of unqualified or unfit clergymen into benefices; and (*c*) the right of parishioners to be consulted on the appointment of a new incumbent.

(*a*) On the first of these points there is universal consensus: there is an abuse, and no one will defend an abuse; but there is less agreement about the remedy, and there is much need of caution in regard to both theory and practice. Patronage is property, and although, like all property viewed rightly, it is a trust, and in some particulars and in certain hands the idea of the trust is the most important element in its character, it cannot be divested of the character of property: nor, whilst it retains this character, can it be entirely, so far as I can see, removed from the category of things that can, one way or another, be bought and sold. The question then is, Under what conditions and restrictions can the right of property be so regulated as to minimise or prevent abuse: and how can those conditions be so guarded as to preclude evasion or collusion, the openings for which will be given alike by too great severity and too great laxness? We cannot, I think, look for any great plan which, getting rid of the proprietary character of advowsons, may lodge all patronage in the hands of a body or bodies in which the idea of trust will altogether expel the idea of property; although we might hope for a time when the possibility of selling an advowson would be restricted within very narrow limits as

to both the seller and the buyer. But we may fairly hope to see the sale of next presentations forbidden, donatives abolished, and the rights of the parishioners to the service of their parish priest protected against the risks and mischiefs of sequestration for debt. Legislation is being sought for all these purposes, as I have pointed out in the first section of this charge.

(*b*) Against the intrusion of unfit presentees to benefices there can be only one valid security—and I hope that there is no risk of its not being a valid security—that is the increase of the power of the Bishops to reject such persons on reasonable grounds, and to extend their inquiries into the fitness of candidates as evinced by their former life and conversation. I am not of opinion that such discretionary power could be put in the hands of the parishioners, who always can make their opinions known ; to allow this would be to make openings for divisions of opinion, unseemly partisanships, and impertinent questionings, on every vacancy in a living ; and no clergyman could enter on a new charge without finding himself an object of suspicion on the part of some, at least, of his flock.

(*c*) And this I feel to be the great objection to what otherwise is a sensible and reasonable proposition of reform: the proposal to consult the parishioners on the nomination of a new incumbent. It is not, I observe, proposed to give them a statutory veto on the appointment ; but a power of official or statutory remonstrance very nearly approaches the character of a veto, and where there is such a veto, there is a danger that it may be exercised either so as practically, on the one hand, to be illusory altogether, or on the other to lodge the nomination of the incumbent in the hands of the parishioners. If we attempt to restrict the number of times that a remonstrance or veto can be exerted, the power must become illusory ; the patron may nominate three impossible clergymen one after another, and so force his own nominee in the end. If the power be unrestricted the people may refuse any appointment until their own nominee is forced

upon the patron. It may be said that the Bishop may be treated in the same way; so he may, I think, under extreme circumstances, but the probabilities are less. On the entire question of the right of parishioners, under any circumstances, there is, as we know, great conflict of opinion: it would be obviously most unwholesome to fill up livings by election or competition; the very idea of the mission of the ministers of God is opposed to the idea of such process; the practical difficulty of appointing by elective committees only shifts the evil one degree back; the unfitness of one class of parishioners, the incompetency of another, the excitableness of another, are valid obstacles. The balance between private judgment and authority, between order and liberty, has to be struck in this matter as in others. I confess that no plan satisfies me which has been offered by the advocates of change; and that I think that nothing but the intrusting the Bishops with greater discretionary power can meet the difficulty at all. I need not say that personally I am not at all desirous of augmenting the burden of responsibility which must follow the increase of such discretionary power. I see that much might be done by increasing the requisites for admission to Holy Orders if that increase were not liable to the risk of repelling really desirable candidates. I am awake also to the fact that, unhappily, the unfitness of a clergyman shows itself, develops, becomes a reality to himself and others, in many cases, after rather than before his ordination. But I must leave this point now—only I can assure you that the whole question, in each of its bearings, and indeed, every device that has been thought of for the remedy of abuses, has been long and is still as present to the minds of the Bishops as it is to that of the most ardent of the reformers. I commend to your notice the arrangement proposed in the Patronage Bill to which I have already referred.

In closing my remarks on this section of the subject I will just add that the essence of the trust in patronage is the responsibility for exercising it to the benefit of the parish. Patronage is not intended for the promotion of

the worthy, or for the retirement of the weary, nor for the benefit of the patron's friends, nor for the encouragement of ambitions, but simply that the best man for the place may be put into the place that is vacant. I wish that this were more present to the minds of men who desire promotion for themselves or for their friends, and that they were conscious of the fact that to press on a patron for a living or other preferment, any man whatever, on any other grounds than that he is the fittest man for the work, is seriously to embarrass the patron, and as seriously to damage the prospects, in many cases, of the man who allows the favour to be asked for him.

Clergy Discipline.

II. After what I have said already about the ecclesiastical courts in the first section of this charge, and just now about the exclusion of incompetent clergy, I will not dwell on the question of the enforcement of discipline on negligent and vicious clergymen. We all know the need, we are all agreed on the main lines to be taken in securing the remedy, and we all know the hindrances that have hitherto operated to prevent legislation. You will not, I hope, think that I am making difficulties, when I say that, even here, there must be caution and patience: here, also, the idea of property runs across the idea of trust; here also the history of the past runs across the needs and experiences of the present: we want to make justice accessible without tempting litigation—and to make justice certain on the one hand and equitable on the other. Here, too, in the event of any improvement being devised, we must needs hold by the good of the flock as a co-ordinate influence with the justice to be done on or for the clergyman. A clergyman is more liable than most men to attacks on his character; and the damage accruing to his reputation from a charge of evil is more fatal to him than to any other man; but it also involves a fatal harm to a far wider circle than himself or his family even; to all who have trusted him as a faithful minister, or have been guided to faith and worship by his means. His fall, or

even the reputation of it, is fatal to himself, is fatal to his usefulness; and in that word usefulness is wrapped up the spiritual welfare of his flock. He needs to be guarded, and he needs to watch himself; he can risk nothing without risking everything. It is no slight responsibility to undertake to do justice, or see justice done, under such circumstances.

Redistribution of Incomes.

III. The idea of such a redistribution of ecclesiastical revenue as would get rid of the present anomalies suggests, as soon as it is named, a series of practical difficulties. It is impossible to deny the anomalies; there are small parishes with very large incomes, and large parishes with very small ones; the idea of merit, applied to patronage, works very much in the direction of giving the better-endowed livings to the abler men, and leaving the ill-endowed livings in the hands of the less capable; and so incidentally to put the most important charges in the hands of the least qualified clergymen: all clergymen are not of the same capacity, or serviceable value; an incumbent's needs are affected by the number of his family, the size of his house, the acreage of his parish, the population of his district: the existing endowments of the Churches are parochial, and there is a certain theoretical inconsistency, as well as a great practical inconvenience, in transferring revenue arising from one parish to the support of another.

There is no doubt that we ought to try in this as in all other matters to bear one another's burdens. Suppose that the richer clergy were to tax themselves for the assistance of the poorer; suppose that all livings over £400 a year were asked to contribute ten or even five per cent. in aid of those which are not up to £200 a year. Can an incumbent with £400 a year and a population of 7,000 be regarded as a richer man than the incumbent of £200 with a population of 700 or 1,000? Can any voluntary taxation be depended upon which does not take into account the heavy deductions, which, in the way of rates, and

absolutely necessary outlay, besides absolutely necessary contributions to works of charity and education, embarrass from time to time the richest livings in the country? If such voluntary taxation were to be universal and assessed on the net value of the preferment, the labour of assessment in the hands of a new staff of officials would cause a heavy and costly deduction from the possible proceeds; and it would be a very heavy addition indeed to the labours of any existing staff such as that of the Bounty Office or Ecclesiastical Commission. Add to this the amount of jealousy, heartburning, and discontent, which, in connection with pounds, shillings, and pence, are apt to insinuate themselves into the highest natures, and it may be fairly questioned whether a voluntary self-taxation, made compulsory by the pressure of clerical and popular opinion, would not do more harm than good.

Let the Bishops begin by taxing themselves. By all means, if the principle be admitted, but I think that you will believe me when I say that, so far as my acquaintance with Bishops goes, the sole result of self-taxation would be the diversion to a general fund of money which already is found insufficient for the special demands of this very sort that press on them in their own dioceses, and which they distribute already with the advantage of personal acquaintance and deliberate judgment on the particular cases before them.

The alternative for such a plan can only be found in the action of a general Commission, analogous in its character to the present Ecclesiastical Commission, which might be empowered to take over the property of the larger benefices, and with the consent of patrons, and I think, also, with some sort of consideration for the parishioners, allot a certain proportion of income to the general fund, from which the poorer livings should be increased. This would do violence to a great deal of local feeling; but that ought to be faced, and might be overcome perhaps by some arrangement for clustering groups of parishes in ecclesiastical unions, just as the aversion felt forty years ago to the alteration and diversion of Cathedral revenues

was overcome by the action of the Ecclesiastical Commission. But, granting so much, there are still the rights of patronage and the law of ecclesiastical property to be adjusted ; and of that I see no prospect.

In fact the question is not entirely a question of the utilising of existing revenue. I believe that there are very few of the largest livings in the country that will furnish their incumbents with income sufficient to enable them to educate their children on the level of the education which they themselves received, and to insure their lives for some provision for them in the rank which they have held, and which in many cases they themselves have earned. Cathedral preferments cannot be diminished without seriously impairing the services of the Church, without seriously diminishing the chances of improving diocesan administration, without seriously damaging the claims of the Church of England to be served by a learned ministry. Into that I need not lead you now ; for nothing can alter the existing circumstances of these institutions. It may not be necessary for every new see to have a great new Cathedral, with an endowed staff of canons. I believe that it is best that it should be so, although it is not, on the face of it, absolutely necessary. But this implies no saving for the present, at least ; and injudicious economies are a very unsafe way of providing additional revenue, at any time.

It is urged, I observe, by some reformers that episcopal incomes should be reduced ; that £4,000 or £5,000 a year is more than ought to be intrusted to one who still is thought fit to be intrusted with the administration of a diocese. It is not for me to speak strongly on such a point ; I believe that I could still earn my bread if I had no episcopal income at all ; but I know that my whole income would not even pay the interest on the sum required at this moment to meet the Church wants of one rural deanery in Cheshire. I will add that the whole annual revenue of the episcopate exceeds, by a matter of £12,000 only, the sum raised by voluntary contributions for Church purposes in this diocese during the year ending

at Easter, 1885. One cannot help feeling that such an economy, whilst it would be a drop in the ocean of our wants, would cripple the Bishops seriously in their local undertakings, and seriously affect, with their power of doing good, the authority that belongs to their position, and, so far forth, to their office also; and I for my part, hearing and reading of such expedients proposed, am forced into a misgiving that the reduction of the Bishop's incomes is a much more prominent object in the mind of the advocates than the improvement of those of the curates.

It remains, I think, for the present period of what is called depression, to make the best use of our existing machinery, and to call in the help of the laity, whose liberality is well illustrated by the case which I have just referred to, to do even more than they do to help us, the Bishops and clergy, who are straining every nerve to help the poverty of our brethren. It is not fair that the Church of the nineteenth century should be living entirely on the benefactions of men of the seventh or of the seventeenth, however much they may have been developed or however economically they may be administered. I fear that anything like a general redistribution could only be seriously attempted by a revolution in the idea of property, and by a defiance or abnegation of the rights of owners, which it would be unwise to attempt, possibly immoral, probably impossible to carry into effect. But very much now might be done and done effectually by a greater effort to make the most of present means. For a man to refuse to contribute to support a poor parish in Birkenhead because a rector in Cambridgeshire has a large income is as absurd as the allegation of such a reason is disingenuous. I am afraid that, in what I have been saying, some of you may think that I have said too much about the rights of property—but I cannot conceal from you my belief that those rights are a primary element in the complication, as well as a most insuperable practical difficulty in undertaking short and sharp remedial action. Land and tithe, pounds, shillings, and pence, are not etherealised or spirit-

ualised because in idea, or by law, they are called religious endowments or spiritual revenues; nor ought they to be so, even if the alternative is a return to a deeper than apostolic poverty.

Uniformity.

IV. The possibility of a relaxation in the Acts of Uniformity, for the purpose of allowing a greater variety of services, and more freedom of adaptation to particular circumstances, is a matter which has called for a long time for a good deal of patient consideration. It is a very hazardous thing to tamper with the Prayer Book. The moment the text of that formula is supposed to be touched there is an influx of various projects of change: there is the risk of ritual alterations, there is the risk of amateur legislation, there is the demand for less rigid definition, there is a demand for shorter services, there is the cry against repetition, there is the prejudice against forms of united prayer, there is the prejudice against uniformity itself. Some amongst us may be inclined to think that, as all the secondary, political, and secular objects for which originally (over and above the idea of the unity of the spiritual body) the Acts of Uniformity were enacted, have already passed, or are rapidly passing away from the region of practical politics, it would be well to abrogate these Acts, and to trust to the sympathy of Churchmen, to the intrinsic merits of the Liturgy itself, and to the unity of feeling that must arise from improved education and acquaintance with history, and the realisation of our religious solidarity, for the practical solution of all difficulties. If we saw that the increase of religious zeal, and the investigation of theological truth, had, or ever has had, such an effect as is contemplated, one would have more justification in appealing to this sense of confidence; but this belongs properly to another point of the proposed reforms. I must only observe now that, for the purpose ostensibly put forward the greater adaptation of Church services to altered circumstances, a short supplementary Act, supplementary to the Uniformity Acts, would suffice—an Act which, maintaining

the typical and normal services unaltered, would allow the addition and substitution of more varied forms under competent authority. I myself should not agree to any proposal which would substitute extemporaneous public prayer for a form of united prayer; it was never meant that public congregational worship should be a substitute for, or dispense with the duty of personal and particular private prayer. I would not surrender one line of the symbolical books of the Church, the Prayer Book and Articles, the Creeds, or definitive expressions of prayer and praise: I would not surrender one of the repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, for I never met a man who, being asked whether, in one, two, or three repetitions, he was really conscious that he had put his heart into every clause, and had asked with spirit and understanding for everything that, when he really sets to work to pray, he feels is wrapped up in those clauses, could reply that he had done so, and could dispense with a supplementary repetition. I would not, further, alter a single rubric in the desire of more exact regulation, or in more authoritative statement of points on which liberty is practically possible. That, I think, sums up the amount of resistance that I should make to change or relaxation. I think that, even as we are at present situated, more might be done in the way of separating the parts of the Sunday service: certain portions of the prayers might be marked for optional recitation whilst guarded against doctrinal manipulation; the reading of the Ten Commandments might be dispensed with except in high celebrations; and, in the case of old as well as new services, alternative forms might be suffered which involved no inconsistencies of signification, no loss of substantial or essential elements, and no introduction of material additional to, or capable of prejudicial interpretation in relation to existing forms. We must remember that we cannot, with all the freedom of organisation that we claim, or would like to claim, for one moment regard ourselves as the possible creators of a new form of Liturgy and a new constitution of public worship. We have to keep the deposit of the past, we have to realise the Communion of the Saints; we cannot build but

on the foundation that has been laid for us : and yet, surely, we have profited little by the experience of the past, entered little into the Communion of the Saints, dwarfed our growth, stunted our building on the true foundation, if we cannot venture on some freer action than has been yet attempted. We do not trust ourselves, we do not trust the clergy, we do not trust the laity, but we do trust in the good hand of our God upon us, and try to develop in new lines, and for fresh circumstances, the forces and the methods alike that have been blessed to us and to our fathers. God grant that it may be given to us to do this, and be to us the author, not of confusion, but of order and of peace, as in all churches of the saints.

The Laity.

V. By what means the laity of the Church of England can be made to realise the responsibility which lies on them as Churchmen, and so to justify their claim to exercise a controlling influence in the management of Church affairs, is a question which demands very peremptorily the careful attention of us all, clerk or lay : and the subject of parochial boards, although that may very possibly be the first point upon which the practical importance of the subject turns, is itself only a subordinate feature in a far wider and greater question. Without attempting on this occasion to marshal an argument, let me touch upon some of the features of the general question. No one can doubt that the thorough working together of the body of the Church in every part does involve the realisation and performance of duties by laymen as well as clergymen. No one can doubt that the weight of the influence of each part should be determined by the real wisdom, experience, and sincerity of the person, or section of society, that claims it. We may talk of trusting the laity, but if we mean, by trusting them, anything more than a rhetorical hyperbole, we mean that we trust them, not as a mere majority of numbers, but as, and so far forth as they are well informed and honest. No honesty will qualify an ignorant man for deciding an abstruse point : indeed, no honest man will pretend to

determine questions in which he is consciously ignorant of elementary principles : no amount of knowledge will qualify an insincere man, or a mere party advocate, for being accepted as a judge where any party question is concerned. We might, I think, with some approach to safety, trust to the honesty of the majority of men, but we cannot safely trust to the knowledge of the majority, nay, we may confidently say that there never was a time, is not, and never will be a time, when the intelligence of the majority is not inferior to the intelligence of the minority—those who *know* are the few, the many are not the wise. This being a tolerably safe assumption, the approved mode by which the honesty of the majority may avail itself of the wisdom of the minority is our own elective and representative system ; and, by that system, as exemplified in Parliament, the laity of England for many centuries have had the opportunity and exercised the power of influencing the management of Church matters ; and at the present day, as I need not say, the power of the laity exercised through constitutional arrangements is very great, the appointments to all the great offices in the Church and to an immense number of livings being vested in ministers whose appointment is in actual fact determined by the laity ; and no coercive legislation being possible in Church matters except by the consent and practically under the initiation of Parliament. But with such control we are now told the laity are not to be satisfied—each individual layman is to realise and individualise his share of direct control. Here, however, comes in another principle—that of authority. The Church is not a mere body of laymen—it is not a body of self-associated, or a self-organised association of a body of laymen, it is a body with a hierarchy of order and a settled ministry, a ministry indeed created for the benefit of the people, but created, as we believe, by a higher authority, and on authorised rules, and with a special organisation, which we for our part do not think that we are justified in materially modifying. There is authority, then, on one side, and freedom of action, freedom of the way in which responsibility should be realised, on the other ; and the balance

between the two principles has to be struck, and has been struck generally in the history of those Churches which claim a historical Church character, by some such method as I have indicated. The clergy are the ministers of God, and they are the ministers of the people. As ministers of God they are bound to consider the good of the people first of all : as ministers of the people they are bound to act on the rules and principles laid down for them by the law divine ; or by that idea of what the law divine is which they accepted when they became and were accepted as ministers of the people. In speaking of authority and a divine law, you must not suppose that I am begging the question, that every jot and tittle of the system of the Church of England is so authoritative and unchangeably fixed as to be incapable of alteration or flexibility in use. I do not maintain any such paradox. But I do maintain that some parts of the system are thus essentially fixed and inflexible, and that the drawing of the line between those parts which are and those which are not, is the function of authority and not of private judgment ; is the function of the informed, not of the uninformed ; is a function of law, not of arbitrary will—of the organised Church, not of the individual, or of voluntary associations of individuals, or of individual parishes or congregations of a community, which maintains common standards, even if it bases its claims on lower historical grounds than the Church's one foundation. A Church council, national or provincial, in which all estates of the laity, as well as of the clergy, should be adequately represented, and due influence apportioned to number, will, and ability, is a desideratum, is the desideratum of the times, and to provide in some measure for the constitution of such a body, or to contrive a provisional expedient which shall supply such a want until the time comes for the development of a more perfect instrument, is the object of all such efforts as we see working in Church Congresses, Diocesan Conferences, and most signally in the new provincial Houses of Laymen assistant on Convocation. But such a council would still require a limitation of subjects of legislation ; that is, the line between the unchangeable

and the changeable parts of the subject matter of discussion must be drawn beforehand. How much more, then, in the cases of simple lay action ; how much more in cases of direct individual action, individual influence, and local control ? The analogy of secular institutions assuredly confirms what I am maintaining. The laity of the law, as well as the laity of the Church, have to recognise the limitation of their executive powers within the limits and under the guidance of authority : the police of the streets are not superseded by vigilance committees—the work of the jurymen is not left to the unrestricted zeal of the amateur—and public sense, if not the force of law itself, limits the discharge of the duty of an advocate to men regularly trained and properly accredited. Consider further how at the present moment, and indeed in history generally, party spirit, excessive alarmism, intolerance, and impatience for definitive decisions, have been far more powerful motives of action among the ignorant than among the better informed, among those who ignore difficulties than among those who face them ; need I say more amongst the laity than amongst the clergy ?

Who is entitled to call himself a layman of the Church of England ? What is the definition, what is the test of laymanship ? This question lies at the root of the matter, whether the point at issue be the right to join in the formation of a national or provincial or diocesan council, or to be a member of a parochial board, or to claim on his own terms the services of the ministers of the Church.

It has been maintained that every Englishman is so far forth a member of the Church of England that he has a right to avail himself of the services of the Church and of her ministers. I should not dispute this, because I hold that, as the Church is a missionary Church, not only every Englishman, but every human being has a right to the good services of the Church, so far as he is capable of accepting them ; mercy to those who want mercy, prayer to those who want prayer, communion to those who are fit to be communicants, and instruction to all who are willing to be instructed. But I need not say that it is in no such

application that the position I have referred to is maintained, and that it is without any qualification of fitness that the claim is made for the exercise of control in Church matters. This definition then, is, to say the least, illusory ; a lay member of the Church who is to be qualified to make any claim—admit it or not—of the kind, must surely be one who is habitually a partaker of the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, and who has never by any act of disobedience or schism separated himself from her communion. Such a person is a layman of the Church, whether or no he is fitted to exercise authority, or to claim a share of control.

When it comes, however, to the point of actually exerting authority, how is the proof of lay membership to be found? Well, simply, I suppose, by a system of registration. But a system of registration throws the difficulty only one step further back. Is the layman to be put on the register on a certificate from a certain number of other laymen, or on the direct acceptance of some test? To the system of certificate it must be objected that in ordinary times the registration would be too easily neglected, and in times of excitement it would be too easily abused. As to the test system, we have to ask, What must the test be? I hope that the use of the Holy Communion as a test of any kind will never be restored amongst us; it cannot be restored without a return to, and an aggravation of, the miserable abuses which were the cause and justification of the legislation that abolished it. Can it be a declaration? "I declare that I am a member *bona fide*." Unhappily, the *bona fides* is that of the sense of the declarer, and if he believes that every born Englishman is a qualified layman, his *bona fides* will justify him in ignoring all the qualifications that I have asked for as indispensable. Nor will any form of test declaration which I have seen proposed obviate all objections that may arise from the temptation, either to unreal profession, as in the communicant test, or to arbitrary interpretation according to the view of the declarer. Whether the system of certificate, with all its drawbacks, is not the best, I must not, as at present in-

formed, peremptorily decide. It is, however, analogous to the plan which is adopted for ascertaining the qualifications of candidates for orders, and, troublesome as it might be, would be a probable safeguard against abuse in ordinary times.

The idea of a system of registration on certificate or testimonial, which, in one form or other, must be adopted for the working of any organisation in which election and representation is used, brings us at once to the question of parochial councils. If we are to have any improvement of local action in which the laymen of each parish may individually or collectively be entrusted with a measure of control in Church matters—who are the particular laymen? What is the nature of their control? and what are the matters on which they are to exercise it? I cannot now go into the details of theory and objections on this, and I have, by anticipation, already traversed the essential parts of the subject. There is a preliminary objection—the difficulty of improving the working of lay co-operation has hitherto lain in the laxity of the laity, in their unwillingness to realise their own responsibility or to share in the work which seemed marked out for them. This has left a great deal, a very great deal, of work on the clergy. Now that the idea of lay co-operation is awakened, there is a great risk that the working of it may fall into the hands of men who are stimulated by the very exigency of the moment into jealousy of, and interference with, the clergy in their proper work: there may be a difficulty in drawing the line of the work, but there is immensely greater mischief possible in the work falling into unfit hands, the hands of the excitable, the idle, and the polypragmosyñic. As a rule men are easy to be found who will take the work of the clergy off their hands, but men who will learn and fulfil the duties of laymen are not so plentiful: you will have preaching laymen and praying laymen, and laymen who will undertake, on the least provocation, to baptise infants, to Church women, to think themselves debarred from the right if you decline their services at the altar; it is not so easy to find men who will act as almoners,

and school visitors, seekers and helpers, judicious and patient, of the sick and afflicted. There is a great risk that, under such circumstances, the functions of the clergy will be assumed by laymen, and the duties of the laymen left to the chapter of accidents ; but the crying risk is that the parochial council will be a field of struggle and jealousy between two powers whose very life and work depend on their being at one.

Suppose, however, that by some such means all laymen who are *bona fide* Churchmen are admitted to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs—that is, to a more direct and individual share, such as would be realised by the constituting of parochial councils with well-defined statutory powers—we should have at once to define the extent and prescribe the rules for the exercise of those powers: to define their extent so as to avoid clashing with the fundamental laws of the Church, and with the constitution of episcopal authority, and to regulate their exercise so that the clergy and laity alike should not be liable to sudden revolutions and summary arbitrary changes. Without for a moment supposing that these powers were to be so large as to affect the basis of Church communion, or even the obligation to obey the rubrics; supposing that they were to be employed so as to show respect for the rights of property and patronage, and not to infringe personal liberty in *bona fide* Churchmen, we may yet understand that they would include “A voice to be exercised by the people in the election of its ministers, in the control of its funds, and in the arrangement of its services.” Granting that, in these matters, there is room for readjustment—and fairly enough, as I think I have made it clear already—it should be made impossible to impose an unfit clergyman on an unwilling flock, it should be made impossible for the endowments intended for the service of the Church to be wasted on personal extravagances or sequestered for the debts of thriftless clergymen, and that the arrangement of service should always have for its determining rule the leading of the parishioners to the glory of God. Granting all this, I am unable to see that

statutory powers can be intrusted even for purposes so limited to fluctuating bodies of *bona fide* Churchmen: all equally honest, no doubt, but very unequally informed, very liable to arbitrary movements of change, very liable to be divided by political and social, as well as personal, partisanships. I cannot pursue the subject further, but I must add that the necessary and only possible supplement and corrective to the risk of arbitrary changes in service, the entire abrogation of independence in the minister, the abolition of authoritative teaching, and the loss of personal influence for good, must be such an increase in the statutory power of the episcopate as I for one should be afraid to contemplate. Parochial councils, of authoritative constitution and statutory powers, can only be kept within the bounds prescribed by the idea of a national, historical, catholic communion, either by a limitation of exercise, which would prove the grant of power to be illusory, or by submission to a review by the diocesan, which would be most dangerous to authorise and hazardous to exercise. There is an alternative in the constitution of a supreme consistory which should revise all decisions of parochial councils; but I venture to think that the powers which would be dangerous in the hands of the Bishops would be tenfold more dangerous, less constitutional, and more liable to abuse, in the hands of a body constituted for the express purpose, and not in harmony otherwise with the system of the Church: a new Court of High Commission.

The Church of England.

VI. Without some such safeguard, however, we should be but one step removed from that ultimate object of the final scheme of reform: the enlargement of the basis of the Church of England, so as to include as far as possible the entire Christian thought and life of the nation. In discussing this project or proposal we are bound, I think, to try to understand what the proposers mean; for that we could for a moment contemplate the possibility of accepting the words as we should ourselves *primâ facie*

interpret them, is inconceivable. We believe the Church of England to be founded on the Rock Christ, the one foundation other than which no man can lay; and to tamper for one moment with the fundamental constitution of the Church, as so based and built up, would be treason, apostasy, and suicidal folly. We are not, however, obliged to understand the memorialists as offering us the boon of a share in the endowments of the Church in compensation for a denial of what we hold to be of faith. Doubtless they also believe that the systems which they wish to incorporate with us, so far as to save the Establishment, are equally well founded, and equally represent Christian thought and life. We may insist that creeds, sacraments, and orders are of the essence of the Church life—they will allow it, interpreting creeds, sacraments, and orders after their own fashion, and demanding for a body which shall incorporate all the Christian life and thought of England, the right and power to reorganise and reform, even to the extent of revolution, all that in which historically the Church of England is at one with the universal Church of other times and other lands. So much, I must again urge, we cannot grant; we may work and pray to recover all the Christian thought and life in England into the Church; we may be glad to remedy all the abuses and to correct the misunderstandings that have alienated any measure or portion of that life and thought; but we cannot—it is not a *non possumus* of obstinate will, but a *non possumus* of the necessity of history—we cannot do that of which even Almighty is incapable; *μόνου γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ θεὸς στερίσκεται, ἀγέννητα ποιῆν ἄσπ' ἂν ᾗ πεπραγμένα*. Doubtless Christ's Church has gone through developments, changes, evolutions, reactions, expansions, and contractions, but it cannot, either in whole or in part, retain its identity whilst it casts away that by which it has grown to what it is, its hold on historic life.

Well, the Church of England does not so present itself to the memorialists. What do they wish us to do? We cannot throw ourselves into particulars—we are not told whether each congregation is to determine for itself the

basis of its communion, or whether all congregations are to eliminate all points of difference ; that is, whether the newly constituted system is to be more intensely sectarian on congregational terms, or more unsectarian in the rejection of all limitation : to have a colourless State Church, or highly coloured concurrent endowment. Into that we need not go, although the idea, taken in conjunction with that of the parochial councils, may seem somewhat appalling : a congregation that may be Unitarian in one year, and Roman Catholic the next, on one vote in the board, would require very determinate statutory powers in the disposal of the mind of its minister.

But what is the force of the higher term, the widening of the basis? It can only be, I think, the removal of all obstacles, in the way of creed, ritual, or order, to the union for religious co-operation, of all sects that call themselves Christians, in the comprehensive body of an established and endowed new community. Is it possible, we may at once ask, to widen the terms of admission into the Church of England so as to admit a body which, whatever may be its faults, errors, weakness, both historical and theological, embraces a large share of the Christian life and thought of the nation? I mean the Roman Catholics. Is it possible to embrace the society, of which I would speak with respect, for its culture, its philanthropy, and its dignified morality, bitterly as I grieve over its negations and its opposition, the Unitarian body? and I believe that, of the memorialists who recommend this widening of the basis, the most prominent are Unitarians. Is the Church to give up the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, that it may take away a stumbling-block out of the way of the Socinian ; infant baptism to conciliate the Baptists ; to modify Holy Orders to propitiate the Presbyterians, or to abolish them to draw in the Independents? And suppose it done, suppose the creeds expunged from the Prayer Book, the sacraments reduced to mere badges of admission to a body without creeds, the Ordinal cut out of the system, and the articles cut down to the simplicity of a western Islam, or esoteric Buddhism. Would the

diverse communities be so reconciled? Would any Roman Catholic, any Baptist, any Wesleyan, any Calvinist, enter the new league? What concession would any of those bodies make, and what good would it do to us or to our cause, if we had any cause left that we wished to have good done to? Would the Roman Catholic surrender the doctrine of papal supremacy; would the Baptist surrender his practice of baptism; would the Calvinist surrender his doctrine of election or perseverance? I may be, I shall be, told that caricature is not argument: but what have I said beyond trying to realise what would result if an experiment of the sort were to be tried? Anything less than this would mean the diversion of the property and title of establishment from a religious, or historical, spiritual work to the work of humanitarianism; the devotion of Church money and power to the alleviation of physical distress, the improvement of secular education, and the promotion of such culture as will diminish the temptations to evil and the consequent tendencies to misery. If the time is come for such a Disestablishment and Disendowment as that, in God's name let it be; but all that can be done without the casting down of the foundations, without the denial of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus and the renunciation of the Communion of the Saints. Let the money and authority go, but leave to us, and not to us only, but to all the conflicting, emulating, and opposing sects, the measure of truth that we have each realised and round which our faith and practice tries to circulate. There is not in history, there is not in probabilities, however cleverly they may be calculated, any authority for believing that surrenders of principle for the purpose of comprehending discordant elements can conduce to unity of thought or life or action; under the name of liberty all liberty is destroyed: the extinction of the discordant elements involves the extinction with them of the life which lives through them. All growth is by differentiation. If we were arguing with philosophers we might argue further: but that which is possible in a school of philosophy is not feasible in the administration of an

educating and authoritatively teaching Church. To leave out the matters which are in dispute between Christian schools, and substitute an unmeaning and barren peace, a programme of good intentions from which all motive power is subtracted, is the merest chimera.

The great fundamental evil of our present religious history, as I have said or implied already, is not difference of opinion, not even difference of belief, but the mischief of self-will and the damage of disproportion. Think for a moment ; the moral evil of schism is self-will—schism in the second generation becomes communion, self-will is exchanged for conservative heredity. There is conservatism in schism, there is self-will in orthodoxy too. The loss in schism is not moral, but spiritual ; he who is born in a community apart from the Church loses the blessings of belonging to the Church. Mind you, we can realise them ourselves, but we have no means of evaluating the loss to others, nor is it for us to limit, even in thought, their relation to their God and ours. The Churchman who refuses to realise his position is in a state of more certain, far more certain loss than the schismatic who ignores it. But when all this is considered, we return to the same point. Practically the life of the communities which we are trying to comprehend is wrapped up in, is essentially contained in, their differentiated and distinguishing tenets. Are we to surrender ours? Are they to surrender theirs? In many cases they are but disproportioned realisations of the same truths, but yet, by disproportion, set in opposition next to contradictory ; they are the mainstay, however, of sectarian life, and however far they may come short of what we should wish to see them, they cannot be harmonised by extinction. The atonement of our blessed Lord is the key to the Roman doctrine of the Mass and to the Calvinistic scheme of justification. Where would Rome be without the one, or Calvinism without the other? He who sees the oneness of the truth shall in time lead us all into it ; but it will not be by making us cast away our partial view, but by bringing us where we can see all and all together.

Now and here we cannot and will not accept the idea of a Church endowed and established, or disendowed and disestablished, which would not contain one man who had faith enough to kindle in him the desire of good works.

I should be very sorry that you should go away with the impression that I am opposed to every proposition of reform which has as yet been formulated, or that I am prepared to accept Disestablishment and Disendowment rather than make a single change in the constitutional administration of the Church of England. It is true that I am not prepared to concede changes which will be fundamental, and I am not prepared to offer terms so hedged in with safeguards as to be really illusory. I believe that our existing system is sufficiently elastic to satisfy all the conditions needed for growth and for the exercise of harmonious and sympathetic liberty. I do believe that of the dark features of the picture which reforming critics present to us, one half is merely the result of false perspective, and the other the vanishing and dissolving presentments of evils of which honest realisation of privilege and duty would make short work. I am opposed distinctly to all such reform as would consist in pulling an institution to pieces in order to construct out of its fragments something that under the same name would have an altogether different character and functions. I am opposed, distinctly, to any reform which would deal with the system, which I believe to be of divine organisation, as if it were a mere human confederation or association fashioned and to be fashioned by varying art and man's device. I am opposed to all schemes which would take advantage of alarm to introduce organic changes—that would involve the destruction of what has been useful and beneficial in the experience of the past in order to promote experimental changes that march on mere theory, ignoring or ignorant of the work that is now doing and that has been done—that would undervalue or treat as non-existent, even if the promoters did not declare themselves hostile to the parochial system, the missionary system, the colonial church system, the training schools and theological colleges, the remaining

quantum of religious education given in elementary schools; and as I believe the Church of England to be the Church of God to this nation, I would resist to the utmost any attempt to alter her terms of communion or the conditions on which she would deal with other communities that set themselves in array against her.

But, as I believe her to be the Church of God to this nation, I trust Him who has called us to give us strength to do our work—and I believe that in that strength we can do it—we can realise the fulness of our obligations, of our rights and duties. Patient and concentrated work, careful economic administration, individualised and harmonised labour, the growing knowledge of true and humble history, the more thorough realisation of corporate unity, the more distinct appreciation of the great vocation wherewith we are called, and above all, and through all, and in all the certain assurance of our union with Him who is the way, the truth, and the life: this will do the work. He will bring it to pass. The history of the last fifty years has shown that faintness and weariness have not overcome us in doing His work who fainteth not, neither is weary. There will be difficulties as long as there is life, and hostility as long as there is energy, but this is the victory that overcometh the world. If the Church of England is not what I have believed her to be, Disestablishment and Disendowment are very unimportant matters, and no reform or readjustment can make the dead bones live: take away her battlements, for they are not the Lord's.

Yet, while I advise quietness and confidence in our true strength, I cannot, I do not conceal from myself that change must come, and very serious change may come very quickly. I, for one, can read in the history of our country no indefeasible privilege of perpetual progress, no immunity from decay, and no right to avoid the responsibility of misused opportunities. If so be that material alterations in the condition, position, and destiny of the nation are upon us, material alterations in the condition and position of the Church of England are upon us too—I will not speak of destiny in such connexion, for the

Word of the Lord standeth sure. Yet all the more, not so much the less, all the more reason, why we should go about our Sion and tell the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks, set up her houses, for it is for those that come after even more than for ourselves that we have to guard the deposit—that they also may praise the Lord.

VISITATION CHARGES

DELIVERED IN

The Diocese of Oxford

FIRST VISITATION CHARGE

JUNE, 1890

The Visitation System.

THE visitation system itself seems to furnish an apt illustration of the truth, so often suggested in our national history, of the new uses to which old institutions in the process of time become applicable. I need not indeed recur to the times when it was thought necessary, by conciliar enactment, to forbid an Archbishop to conduct his metropolitanical Visitation with more than fifty horses in train, or a Bishop with more than thirty : in those days Archdeacons had to be restrained from taking more than seven ; Rural Deans indeed might, as in many cases they have still, a modest pair, whilst all alike are forbidden to wile away the tedium of the expedition with hawks or hounds. Times were changed after that, and yet scarcely brought into the measures of modern fashion, when, as in Queen Elizabeth's time, the clergy of each deanery were expected, at the General Chapter held after the Visitation, to prove by examination their progress in the knowledge of the Gospels in Latin and in English ; or when, as in the following century, the churches were prepared to receive the diocesan with a fumigation of frankincense and a new strewing of rushes. The modern business of the Visitation Court is small indeed compared with what it was when presentments of every moral or legal irregularity of laymen and clergy alike found their way into the returns, and the great array of jurisdiction for the correction of souls in the spiritual court was marshalled side by side with indictments and presentments before the king's justices, for

identical or similar offences against the wholesome discipline of religion. Changes in the law of the land have removed very many of the old articles of inquiry from the view of the spiritual jurisdiction, and, although it is still very greatly to be desired that a readier and more expeditious method should be devised for dealing with undeniable abuses, it is not a matter of regret that the temporal law should have set itself to work for social and moral reformations. When perjury, bigamy, jactitation of marriage, and the whole string of presentments connected with matrimonial suits, slander and defamation, rough practical jests, as well as false doctrine, heresy, and schism, were matters not only of inquiry, but of action resultant on inquiry, and leading to excommunication, with the consequent exertion of the secular arm, it is quite possible that the Bishop would require a strong staff of officers for his safety, and of lawyers for his counsel.

If the improvement in our laws has relieved us from much business of a kind with which the clergy never were especially well qualified to deal in the direction of coercive discipline, the growth of a more distinct sense of religious propriety, and honesty in the recognition of obligations, has made another, and that the chief surviving topic of formal visitation, much easier to be handled. The condition of the churches and church goods, although not universally as good as we might wish it, is now so well watched and so carefully maintained, that the Visitation questions are capable of very formal and uniform answers from year to year. The churches that are dilapidated, ill furnished, or squalid, are the exceptions in every diocese to the rule; and, I think, in this diocese they are very rare exceptions, and they are rapidly becoming fewer, notwithstanding the depressing influences that have now for so many years been affecting the agricultural counties. Of this, in relation to our own diocesan administration, I may have something to say by-and-by. The inquiry into such matters is still very useful as a reminder, and a spur to the successive officers of the several parishes, that they should see that the charge which they solemnly undertake be

adequately fulfilled, and the interests committed to them take no detriment by their neglect during their tenure of office. The questions, although they may be easily and formally answered, are not matters of form, and their very recurrence may very well be made, by a devout parish priest and energetic churchwardens, an occasion of effort for improvement.

What is a Diocese?

What is a diocese? I do not ask myself for any logical or even historic definition, but just so much of a description as will help us to realise our relation to the general body of the Church, and to our own subdivisions of work and duty. In relation to our National Church, we, as a diocese, have a more distinct character than is represented by the mere geographical expression. We are a Bishop, clergy, and laity, within a definitely drawn outline of country, realising an administrative unity both for common objects within, and for common objects without, our own border. The Bishop, as the minister of the Church of his diocese, has his place, not exactly or technically as a representative, in the Councils of the Realm and in the Convocation; the clergy have their representatives in the Convocation and, in common with the laity, in Parliament; the laity have their parliamentary representation constitutionally; and both in the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, and in the newly organised House of Laymen of the Province of Canterbury, a place, not yet perhaps recognised by constitutional law, but quite as influential as to the practical politics of the Church as if it had, and only waiting for the formal recognition. These are the outward expressions—and for the moment I am not going to treat them as more—the outward expressions of our relations to the Church of England. We have a common right and duty to the great body in whose care is historically deposited the Christianity of the English nation. I am aware that I am using language open to criticism, but I am speaking in general terms, and not intending in the slightest degree to reflect

on forms of Christian belief and organisation that are outside our own communion. What I need say about such I shall reserve to another part of this charge. Looking deeper, we recognise further our position as contributories to the active work of the Church in its collective capacity, as a great missionary agent to the heathen, as a great educator of our own people, as a sharer, if not claiming the character of originator, of all plans of beneficence which have a general bearing, and are worked on principles which form a vital part of the teaching of the gospel which we preach. This function is discharged by the great societies of which each diocese has its own subsidiary association or branch, and which, although not worked by the exact organic machinery of the Church, are worked by men who have their place in that machinery, and, in practical detail, in the closest co-operation with the parochial and diocesan organisation. And looking deeper still, do we not feel that, in that innermost life which, through the help that every joint supplieth, maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love, we all alike, having one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one form of worship, one scheme of working, one great end and aim in relation to Church and nation, are a living part of the great body which is to us, in flesh and blood, in mind and spirit, the presentment of the mystical body of the Lord? By our prayers and offerings, our sympathies and our co-operations, we do try to realise this, that we are Christian, Catholic, English, Churchmen.

But in proportion as we realise our relation to the Greater Body, are we so sure that we realise our relation to the Smaller Members, the subordinate organisms and organisations that lie within our own area? I do not merely mean, do we regard our relations to one another in rural deaneries, archdeaconries, parishes, as we regard our relations to Parliament, Convocation, or the great religious societies: we scarcely can be expected to do it so vividly. I do not think it well that we should run the risk of confining our Church life to the local and languid channels that such organisations present to us, any more than that

we should, in realising our relations to the greater body of the National Church, restrict or limit or narrow down sympathies that we should give to the whole of the mystical body of the Lord. But there is a risk both ways, and there is a most excellent way of treating both sets of obligations. The general relations by themselves are apt to grow diffusive, unreal, superficial; there is no influence in the world so weak as indefinite Christianity: the localised sympathies by themselves are apt to sink into mere personal likings and dislikings, restricted and ungenerous exclusions, vanities and vexations of place and party, and personal fussiness. We laugh at the good Churchman, clerk or lay, who is always on platforms, or in London on committees whilst his own parish is going to the dogs; we grieve over the good Churchman who looks at the embellishment of his own parish church, with elaborate expenditure, as the one object in life, when the children of his neighbour's parish are, for the lack of that which he might have easily spared them, deprived of that religious teaching which he, at least, believes to be a part of the training that they ought to have in the beginning of wisdom, the praise of which endureth for ever. In saying this, you will understand I am pointing out a risk, not arguing or wishing to argue on experience of facts.

But, all said and done, it is by our dealing with the direct and concrete occasions and personalities that our duty is to be done to the great body of the Church; only by the very terms of the proposition it is to be a dealing as wide and as well organised as practical dealing can be. And the diocesan arrangement of the Church is itself, and by its subordinate dispositions, organised for this purpose, to enable us to work in practical sympathy for collective ends—the practical and living diffusion of spiritual energy, not wasted on mere general aspirations, or exhausted on uneconomised prodigality, but so husbanded as to produce its fullest work on the accessible area. In a word, certain of our duties to the Church of England become most practical in our working in our own diocese; certain of them, I say, not all, for it would be absurd to exclude

either of the other sets of areas. Only, as I must repeat, it is in proportion as we realise these that we are most likely freely and sensibly to recognise and discharge those.

Hindrances to Work. (a) Nonconformist Competition.

I have no doubt that the competition of Nonconformist communities is to the faithful parish priest a source of constant disquietude—a disquietude which it is almost impossible for an outsider to realise. It is a painful thing to have in your parish a centre of disaffection; an attraction towards which everyone whom you have occasion to reprove, or to whom it is your duty to give unpalatable advice, or whom, out of mere inadvertence, you may have offended, may draw near, knowing that he revenges himself on you by the desertion, and palliating his vindictive feeling by the idea that he is not forfeiting his right to call himself religious. It is an additional grief when you find the children whom you have tried to educate as children of the Church drawn away from you to teaching which, if convinced of your own mission and its essential truths, you must believe to be in error. And there are other and perhaps more seriously personal mortifications in the background. But these evils are evils which may be overcome, and can only be overcome, by good: and you must not let yourselves be provoked to conduct which makes or shows a festering sore. The evil is not in the direct competition of the Dissenting bodies, which consist of men who believe in their system probably as strongly as you believe in yours, who unquestionably have the good of religion, as it has presented itself to them, as the main object of their work. The evil is in the use made of the competition. And that must not be visited upon them. I should recommend in all such cases the maintenance of such friendly relations as are possible and consistent with a firm maintenance of the obligations to which you are bound. You cannot take part in the services that are based on principles opposed to those of the Church, nor in the management of institutions in the administration of which questions of discipline, order, and ecclesiastical govern-

ment continually arise; but you can avoid and disarm hostility: you need not expose your sensitiveness, you must not encourage the bitter relations which put it in the power of everyone who may have a grudge against you, caused or causeless, to harass you, and which actually tempt them and you to the exercise of unchristian feelings. A word on this is sufficient, and perhaps, under the circumstances, it is not uncalled for.

(b) Politics.

As to the harass of political excitement and the hindrances of party obstructiveness, I cannot now say very much. The former touches on the wide subject of Church Defence, and the latter on party questions which are far too large to be taken as a subdivision of a long charge. But I may say this much: we are often told that a clergyman should have no politics; we are almost as often reminded that a clergyman is also a citizen—and if he is a citizen he must have politics, and if he has politics he must be a partisan. I say, let him have politics, let him be a partisan if he likes; and if he has politics and is a partisan, he must not expect that all his parishioners will have the same as his, or will conduct their tactics as he does his. The mischief lies not in the existence of parties in politics, but in the conduct of party warfare and in the maintenance of party spirit. Let politics be kept out of the regions with which they are not concerned, and let the partisans content themselves with struggling with lawful weapons. It is impossible, you say; anyhow, it is unhistorical; never were there politics that kept themselves within limits of area, never was there a party struggle fought out by absolutely pure hands. Very likely not; but the parish priest may well content himself with trying to do what he can in the right direction, not skirting responsibilities, but not yielding to party temptations. And if he does, he will, however much he may grieve over the divisions of his parishioners, or their being led to join in attacks on the Church and on himself, or their being misled into absolute hostility to what he

loves and honours, he will not break his heart over what cannot be helped, or commit himself to assertions or an attitude that shall make reconciliation impossible when the time of the tyranny is overpast. I acknowledge, it is hard to bear: we cannot afford to say we do not care; but there is the remedy of faithful work and prayer, and a stay under God in the maintenance of a pure conscience.

(c) Party Divisions.

As to the hindrances arising from our own party divisions in Church matters—cases in which a man refuses help because the ritual of the parish church is such as he does not like, or will not be churchwarden because he finds fault with this, that, and the other detail; or where petty malignity, such as is always at work in one way or another, takes advantage of controversial points to create embarrassment, obstruction, or division, such as is the cry of no popery, ritualism, and the like—I can only recommend caution against giving causes of offence, tolerance of opposing views where they are sincerely held and temperately maintained, and the last somewhat forlorn counsel of patience in cases where the party evil takes its more acute and inveterate form. It is not a useless or uncomforting advice, patience, even if it seems a forlorn one. No good cause persecutes—the very use of malignant hostility condemns so far forth the cause of the party that employs it, and consoles the sufferer with the feeling that his position must be the right one, when so much of evil influence, unmistakable intolerance, with all its weapons of prejudice and misrepresentation are arrayed against it. I do not warrant the conclusion as logical, but I can recommend it as comforting, and, what is better than comforting, as carrying with it a warning that may keep the patient man from being provoked to evil: be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. The old heathen was right, when he saw that patience helps to turn the adversary's weapon against himself—"Fit melius ferendo, quicquid corrigere est nefas."

(d) Unfit Clergymen.

Among those points which, although by no means of minor importance, are still capable of very brief discussion, one is the attempt which a Bishop in these days must make to secure that the welfare of the Church shall not be injuriously affected by the carelessness of the clergy, or of churchwardens acting in the vacancy of livings, as to the character and antecedents of the clergymen employed to take occasional or temporary duty. It is by no means a pleasant part of a Bishop's functions to have to be constantly reminding his diocese of this; nor is it any compensation worth considering to be told that the scandals arising from this carelessness are comparatively few. In my experience they are not few, they are not unimportant: in some parishes they are recurrent; in all cases they are scandalous. It is no secret that there are in this country a considerable number of disgraced clergymen: that is, of men who, by misconduct of one kind or another, have so far disqualified themselves from being able to do useful work that they are practically cashiered. There are some who have been removed from their parishes by the direct process of law for offences which, although disgraceful, are not criminal. There are some who have resigned their ecclesiastical positions rather than face inquiries. There are some whose habits have become so notorious that no one who exercised the most superficial circumspection in making inquiries would dream of nominating them for curacies. These men are in many cases able and plausible—men who, if they could be recovered from the evil habits they have formed, might be useful, very useful indeed, but who cannot be trusted to exercise any self-restraint, or who cannot escape the notoriety given them by sins which they may have truly repented, but the scandal of which continues and must continue to adhere to them. Many of them are constantly seeking work, advertising in respectable newspapers, and able when communicated with to produce testimonials from credible referees, whose experience of them has been anterior to the disqualifying fall, or who have never heard

of it at all. And there are, I grieve to say, even in a diocese like this, which has been carefully watched so long, cases in which such men have been employed, have been tried and failed, and brought scandal on the Church, in spite of all cautions continually repeated. There must be, I conclude, clergymen in charge of parishes who employ such people, to the extreme risk of their parishioners, to the great diminution of their own usefulness, and to their own eternal shame and sorrow when they discover what mischief has been done. It is of no use to say, why do the Bishops suffer such things to take place? It is not the Bishops that can help it: they cannot issue a list of interdicted clergy; no law would authorise or suffer that. They cannot from week to week inquire who is going to take next Sunday's service in each parish, nor secure that it shall be taken by the person who answers the question. They can only urge the clergy to greater carefulness, and then wait until the mischief is done which they have to try too late to undo.

Now I know that there are hundreds of parishes in the three counties that are, so far as this matter goes, absolutely safe, parishes in which the incumbent will not absent himself for a single day unless he leaves a substitute whom he trusts as firmly as he would himself, who could not enjoy a fortnight's holiday unless he was quite sure that his parish was as well looked after in his absence as in his presence. But there are a great many parishes where this is not the case, in which anyone with fairly decent testimonials may find employment; and there are some in which the only consideration about the employment of a *locum tenens* is how cheaply his services, whatever they may be, can be procured. And for these three sorts of parishes we can have but one law of administration: the restriction which is a necessity for the careless clergy is a restriction which the most careful must learn to tolerate for the general safety.

Of the two expedients which have been adopted by way of security and insurance against the intrusion of unworthy clergymen, one is the establishment of a trust-

worthy agency, to which in emergency the clergyman who is anxious for a holiday, or is obliged by ill-health or business to absent himself, may apply for the recommendation of a fitting substitute : there has long been in Oxford an agency of this kind, which has been generally successful and safe. The official list of clergymen approved or sanctioned by the Bishop, and outside of which the agency in question does not recommend any clergyman for employment, has been a great safeguard for the surrounding parishes, and continues to be so. During the last year a second agency of a more definitely diocesan character has been set on foot by Mr. Trotter, of Ardington, which, proceeding on the same lines, will probably have a wider area, and eventually a larger list of employés, and which likewise will recommend no one who has not the Bishop's recognition. There are in London agencies of still wider extension in the offices of particular societies, the A.C.S., for instance, and, I believe also, under the auspices of the E.C.U. : possibly other societies. And there are also offices of more speculative and private adventure, where, we may suppose, out of mere regard for their own interests, the agents would be careful about their recommendations. But the best of these are not safe, and the less than best are like the newspaper advertisements, an open fountain for scandals. I think that I am not going beyond what I am bound to do, when I beg the clergy and churchwardens not to choose their men by the advertisements, and not to apply to any agencies which are not either directly or mediately in relation to the diocesan scheme. It would put you to shame and horror if I were to give public utterance to things which have happened within the last few months by reason of the neglect of such precaution.

The second expedient is the direct reference to the Bishop himself in all cases : it is one which involves a great deal of labour in the way of correspondence, but it is a task which I am quite willing to undertake ; and it is the canonical way of securing the prevention of scandal. It is that which I have, following the example of the previous

Bishops, and the very words and instructions of the Archbishop of Canterbury, sketched in my circular letter to the clergy, and which is reprinted in the Diocesan Calendar. It is a rule which every Bishop on his appointment to his see has to consider and reissue, and the enforcement of which ought to be regarded by the clergy as an innovation, merely because they have had to be reminded of its existence as a part of the diocesan government. It contains four points:—

(1) The keeping in every church of a book containing the names and addresses of all strange preachers. I wish that that provision should be extended, and that in every church a book should be kept in which every sermon should be registered, with the name of the preacher, his text, and the amount of the collections made in church at each service. Such a book is kept already in many churches, and might be in all with very little trouble and very great benefit.

(2) That no incumbent allow any clergyman unlicensed by the Bishop, or personally unknown to himself, to officiate at all in his church without having seen his letters of orders and testimonials, or the permission of the Bishop who has seen them, and that in all cases the second occasion of the kind should be signified to the Bishop.

To these are added (3) a direction that no temporary arrangements should be made with an unlicensed clergyman except with the Bishop's permission, and (4) that no clergyman absent himself at all without providing due Sunday and weekday ministrations for his people.

Of the last two I need say no more than that No. 3, from the very nature of the case, is fairly well observed, and No. 4 must be left to the conscience of the particular clergyman. It is the second on which a small amount of difficulty and increased correspondence turns. And this is specially felt in the large parishes where clergymen of influential position and with a large circle of clerical friends are at work, where it is certainly irksome to have to report to the Bishop every instance in which an offer of help, often sorely needed, has been accepted. It is irksome, and

it is no small tax on the Bishop either, but if the remedy for the evil, which undoubtedly exists, is to be practical, it must be universally applied, and the strong must endure to bear the infirmities of the weak. There are ways in which the pressure might be relaxed in the few large parishes where it is felt; for instance, a copy of the leaf of the preachers' book might be communicated to the Bishop monthly, so that no great risk could be run of unworthy or unfit persons intruding themselves under the screen of personal acquaintance or special exigency. It is a very small grievance sentimentally, and practically need be none at all.

Let me recommend this matter very seriously to the attention of all concerned; and all are concerned in keeping the evil and dangerous element out of the way of our congregations. And let me, finally, urge upon you to remember that no amount of zeal will palliate any the smallest amount of carelessness; that no confidence of partisanship will excuse you from responsibility for the most careful examination of the character of those whose services you avail yourselves of; that the most interesting sermon in the mouth of a man who is found out to be a drunkard or profligate is only an aggravated scandal; and that it is quite possible for a man of good address and nice manners to make himself so acceptable in a parish, that when mischief comes he will be not without friends who will refuse to accept the clearest evidence of his delinquency. There is, too, the case of men who, having sinned and repented, appeal to us for fresh probation and opportunity of recovering character and usefulness. For all such let due consideration be shown, and such sympathy as is safe. But no Bishop and no parish priest is justified for one moment in making one parish or one section of his flock the *corpus vile* of an experiment by which he can try whether the penitence of a sinning clergyman, a criminous clerk, is sincere or not. The people of God are not to be sacrificed or put in hazard even for the rehabilitation of the most promising penitent.

Faculties.

I ought not perhaps to close this section of my charge without a word on a subject which has been a good deal discussed since I came into the diocese, and about which there is a good deal of division of uninformed opinion ; I mean that of faculties for alterations in churches. I believe that it is generally admitted, that without such legal sanction as the system of faculty offers, no alteration can be safely, securely, or lawfully made in the fabric or structural furniture of churches ; but there are objections to the application of the rule on the ground of expense, on the ground that the regular process in such cases is such as to provoke or invite opposition from discontented or obstructive parishioners, and on the ground that such small alterations as the insertion of windows of stained glass, and the like, are too trifling to be subject to such strict conditions, and that the permission of the Bishop himself, informally given, would suffice amply for security in such cases. I am quite willing to give their due weight to such objections ; but I am quite sure that all together do not nearly outweigh the importance of the rule and its observance. So far as the question of expense is concerned, the objection is met by the reduction of fees in the case of unopposed faculties as promulgated in the paper of Rules, which, with the assistance of the Chancellor and Archdeacons, were put out in 1889. The small fee required is certainly not too much to pay for the legal security which is obtained by the faculty. The objection that the enforcement of the rule may be made a hindrance to church improvements, and invite or provoke opposition from hostile or obstructive parishioners, is more important, and the reasons that overrule it are, as it seems to me, much more weighty. First, it is extremely unadvisable that the clergy or the Church laity of any parish should, by introducing changes in the church, seem to try to steal a march on the parishioners in general. The Bishop is the guardian of the rights of the parishioners as well as of the parish priest, and it is his duty to ascertain, before an alteration in a church is proposed, whether it is subject to any opposition, reasonable

or unreasonable, factious or obstructive, which affects any question of right or law, or even expediency. He has a right to see that proper publicity is given to every proposal, even of decided improvement. Secondly, however, the judgment of the court is not subjected to the decision of the vestry or to the obstruction of individual members. The Chancellor of the diocese, who issues the faculty, is the ecclesiastical judge, and it is for him to determine for or against the application, as he deems it lawful, or expedient, or desirable, whatever the character of the obstruction may be. With these two points before us, I think that we may see that, whilst duty and expediency require publicity to be given to the proposal of improvements, the authority and discretion of the Chancellor is sufficient to counteract the risk that such publicity may invite unreasonable or factious criticism; and there is safeguard also in the very nature of costs.

As to the third objection, or I should rather say, competitive plan, the informal permission to be given by the Bishop to the introduction of windows, and the like: I can only say that, as I have no special qualification for judging of such things, and no inclination to make myself responsible for things which I have no qualifications to judge of, I see far more risk and trouble in the informal permissions than I do in the payment of a guinea for an unopposed faculty. At the same time, I recognise that there are small things which, as being of the nature of repairs, can be done without recourse to me, or if the advice of the Rural Dean can be had, without reference even to the Archdeacon. If any doubt arises, I am, for these small improvements, ready to give due weight to the judgment of the Archdeacons, whose advice I recommend the clergy and churchwardens to take before they apply for a faculty, or begin to consider the possibility of dispensing with one.

But it is about the windows that I have the most misgiving: the questions of taste, of art, of conformity with the architecture and character of the Church, the religious or historical character of the design, the question of diminishing the light, of displacing other memorials, and

the like, are all matters which require more local memory and discrimination than can be expected from a Bishop, who has full occupation for his time, and who has, it may be, strong views that will not always suit themselves to the ideas of the benefactors who want to make the change. Order, symmetry, security, and convenience can only be attained by having these things done legally and in order.

Church Defence.

I proceed now to make some few remarks on the subject of Church Defence—a matter which is at all times of very great importance, and which during the last few years has been, as it will for the next few years certainly be, a very constant occupation to those who watch and pray for their country and its faith. For the Church—the Church of England, that is, which is to us our point of contact and means of incorporation into the great body of the Church Catholic, is now, and is likely to be, an object of very determined attack on many points and from many quarters. And it is most expedient, it is most necessary, that the defence should be conducted on such principles as, under the divine protection, the experience of human history shows most likely to be successful. Such a defence involves at least five such principles, all five, however, being but varied functions of the one great Evangelic principle, the faith that overcometh the world.

The first is the certain realising of the cause which we are engaged to defend ; the confident belief that it is the right cause, and that it is one which is worth every effort and every risk ; such a belief as involves the understanding of the merits of the case, the strong and weak points of the position, and which unites determined love of the thing to be defended, and devotion which will not spare sacrifice.

The second is the persevering energy which turns this belief into action, and shows the attacking force that we are sincere in our defence, as well as careful and watchful and energetic in our operations.

The third is that in all things our measures should be

constructive rather than combative ; the strengthening of our position rather than the nervous and sensitive policy that puts itself forth to meet attack. We should build ourselves up and our cause, as well as sharpen our arms and anoint our shields, and the constructive defence must be at the back of all aggressive or repelling action.

The fourth is that our defence should be proportionate and universal along the whole line, not calculated for the hour or the day, but equable all round ; not giving all study or all argument to one or two points which may be attacked to-day, and safe to-morrow, but with the armour on the right hand and on the left, knowing that the points which seem safe to-day will be attacked very soon, all the sooner, it may be, when it is noted that a disproportionate amount of energy is bestowed on the point that is assailed at present.

And, fifthly, the defence must be generous and honest ; generous, in that we know that those who attack us may be as confident of their cause as we are of ours, and that we should struggle as with men who one day may be our best friends ; honest, in that we know that no success of defence or attack either can justify the use of means which are not according to the laws of fair combat. In our struggle, they who use the weapons of the world are *ipso facto* defeated by their own arms. We trust in God to keep us honest and true and strong, and in that trust we wait and work for our victory.

The points of attack vary at different times ; at this moment there seem to be three special points in which the cry is raised against us as the Church of England Established and National. We are told that our ecclesiastical character, our institutions, our doctrinal position, our historical claims, are not what we have believed them to be ; that our endowments ought to be taken from us, and that our recognition as a constituent part of the theory of the commonwealth must be withdrawn. In a word, we are not a true Church ; we are not the Church of the nation ; our property, our political position, are wrongs to the liberties and consciences of those who do not think

with us, and practical measures of suppression and forfeiture are to be taken, on the foregone conclusion that we are not, have ceased to be, or never were, what we, at all events, have believed, and are considered to pretend that we are.

Now, following the lines of defence which I have sketched, our first lesson of training should be the thorough realising of what we claim to be, the Church of God established in this nation; a realising which involves a great deal of doctrinal as well as historical intelligence, but yet not more than may be expected from those who, with the Bible, the Prayer Book, and their national history in their hands, undertake the work. We should learn how to prove that in doctrine and institutions, in creeds, government, and divine service, we are really at one with the Church of the apostles and the earliest presentment of the mystical body of the Lord; and then we should learn the history which tells how that doctrine and institutions, creeds, government, and divine service were brought to our fathers; and how they have continued in unbroken succession, in corporate identity since the first days, growing into the national growth which grew by their aid, and under all the changes and chances of the varying times retaining their essential character unimpaired except by the inconsistencies of individual administrators.

We have to realise next how the Church of Christ, thus planted in and gathering under its branches the nations of our fathers, acquired the property which is at this moment the material objective of attack; we might so be able to prove that the source of our endowments was either in private devotion of gifts of land, or in the more general compliance with the ancient custom of the obligation of tithe; both of them secured in the long process of ages by prescription, and enforced by all such expedients of legislation as the possession of material rights and properties can be defended by. And this means a knowledge of national and Church history, such as is really within the reach of all educated people, to be without which ought to be a mark of gross ignorance. If the

national history is to be taught, as it should be, in our elementary schools, this knowledge must soon become general; if it is not to be so taught, it is a very bad augury for the next age. No nation can continue to be great that parts with the memory of its own growth; and the knowledge of the growth of England can never be acquired without some acquaintance with the work and workings of the Church.

This then ascertained, we are bound to take into consideration the attitude, the policy, the principles, and the methods of those who assail us: to reckon with their sincerity, their experience, their practical justification. We know that we have to conduct a defence against the Church of Rome, which denies our doctrinal system, denounces our historic position as a usurpation, declares our succession of ministers and transmission of gifts and ordinances to be an imposture. We know that we have to reckon with a congeries of communities that have broken away from us on some point of doctrine or government, or even on some ground of personal administrative offence, have erected, on what may have been a minute and reconcilable matter at first, a fortification in which all their conservative as well as their aggressive forces are embodied: great communities which, having received from the Church of England the Scriptures and the doctrinal training which they retain, but rejecting her laws and order, seem to regard her retention of her own institutions as in itself an aggression on the liberty and equality of religious systems. And with these the struggle of the Church is not merely against the errors, as they seem to us, which led to the original separation, but against the whole mass of impulse and momentum which the experience of their history, as well as of our own, has served to accumulate. But further, and this is perhaps at this moment the pressing danger from the outside, we have to reckon with a set of forces which are urging change from non-religious as well as from the religious points of view: forces some doctrinaire and empiric, some revolutionary, some antichristian, some social and political or even personal, in which the ideal benefit of future society

is being sought by the practical ruin of all present existing constitutions. I cannot characterise more in detail the forces of which I speak: under different names and aspects they are at work in all the countries of Europe, and in forms far more extreme than here; the overthrow of Churches, of Christianity itself, being only one feature of the programme of universal change.

It is quite obvious that against such assailants the same weapons are not equally effective, and the same champions are not equally competent. The ablest defender against Rome may be a very inadequate combatant against socialistic attacks. The struggle with the competing communities or Churches of Nonconformists is a struggle on a diversity of points which may require a diversity of studies and a diversity of argumentative skill. These matters in their detail must be left to those who make of them a special study. But at the very foundation and basis of all systems of defence must be that common realisation of belief and duty of which I spoke. This it is in the power of all to attempt, and there are ready at hand means of attempting it successfully. There are abundance of good books; there is a widespread and spreading scheme of lecturing, and otherwise educating those who are interested in the work: in our own diocese, in the schemes for higher education and for the Church history lectures, we have a vehicle for bringing the advice about reading, the books themselves, and the systematised results of study, before all who are willing to learn. In the lectures of the Church Defence Institution we have a machinery of a more popular kind, capable of great adaptation, and most useful in dealing with those who have not much time for reading. And there are many other influences which may be brought into play without the risk of encouraging a litigious or controversial spirit. All who care for truth, whether with us or against us, may well take heed to these things. There is much interest, even curious and local interest, bound up with it all. The Church of England is our own, the Church at all events of our fathers, the guide of the way in which God has brought us into His

family. These things are worthy of our study and love in other than controversial ways. And these avenues of interest and affection lead to points of vantage and posts of honour which are well worth guarding; tell the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks; they are our charge to keep for those that come after.

But there is a further consideration, the importance of which cannot be overrated. No system of Church defence can be effective that is not animated and supplemented by action. No chest of title-deeds, however full, will maintain an extinct family in possession of its estates, or the property of a bankrupt owner out of the hands of his mortgagees. No institution can live on the credit of its past achievements; and sometimes the inability to carry on or outdo the past achievements is made a reasonable ground for abolition. There are some things which cannot be taken from the Church; whatever happens she is the Church of the national history, of the conversion, the constitution, the Reformation, the Church of the translated Bible, the Church of the Prayer Book. But how if she has the name that she liveth and is dead? Such Churches there have been, and are; that have forgotten their first love, that have hardened themselves in a shell of self-complacency, that have contented themselves with assertion: the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we. Now we are constantly being reminded or reminding ourselves of this; a Church may be in its history a National Church, and in its life and operation have ceased to be one. I do not use the vulgar argument that a Church which retains the name of a national Church must be the Church of the majority; it need not be the Church of the majority possibly in future days, as it certainly in the days of the Conversion was only the Church of a minority. But it must be an aggressive and extending agent. If it is to continue to live, it must show and exercise the functions of life. Church extension is Church defence; the Church of England must show that she recognises the needs of the nation and the time, and like all other things, all other institutions, she is on her

trial, judged, and likely to continue to be judged, by the results of her working. This is true; a conclusion warranted by the consideration of things spiritual as well as of things temporal: the world will not continue to recognise a Church in which the spirit of life is extinct: the Lord of the Church Himself cannot save the Church which has lost the spirit of power and love and soberness, the salt that has lost its savour. And the need of this living energy is not satisfied with sectarian activity: that is, highly as we place the love of our Church and the vindication of its claims among the motive forces of our corporate action, that is not all: we try to spread the knowledge of the truth in foreign lands, we try to maintain the standard of religious education amongst our own people, we try to raise the morality of our fellow-countrymen in purity and temperance and truth and honesty, not simply and solely because we want to secure the credit of doing so for the Church to which we belong, but because we know it to be our duty and privilege as Christians, and because the love of our Lord for us constrains us to bring all whom we thus can within the operation of the same constraint. We do believe our own to be the most excellent way, and its system the best system, but we are expected to work in that way and in that system; not merely for it as a way and a system, but in it for the ends for which it was devised, as we think by our Lord and His apostles, and tried by the experience of eighteen centuries.

In saying this, you, I trust, will not think that I am talking claptrap, especially after what I have said about Church Defence in the last half-hour. It is indeed a very searching consideration: practically it has a very definite bearing upon our conduct as members of a diocese; that is, of an administrative member of the national Church. We have each in our own parishes a field of work among our fellow-parishioners, in our own neighbourhoods a task of bearing the burdens of those whose burdens by personal acquaintance we see to be too great for them. In our own diocese we have a duty to help in the corporate work of which a diocese is the exponent and the agent; in our own

relation to our Church and nation, a duty by our performance of which not only our loyalty to our Church and nation will be tested, but the very character, reputation, utility, and efficiency of the Church and nation will be judged by foreign opinion and in all coming time. The great defence, so far as this side of the subject goes, has its key in the rule of our Lord, "Let your light so shine before men." The chief defence of nations is the loyalty and innocency, the strength of the good cause realised by its people in liberty and growth. The great defence, humanly speaking, of the Church is the energy that her children put forth in doing the duty that is incumbent on them as a Church.

Clerical Poverty.

I must say a few words upon a very painful point ; I mean that clerical poverty, which is rapidly becoming a topic of commonplace interest. I wish to speak with much sympathy, and, at the same time, without depressing those with whom I would sympathise. There is no doubt about the fact : it is true in this diocese, where there seems to be an extraordinary number of very small livings, with small populations, too widely scattered to be united in larger parochial areas, and with very small incomes, which there is no means, except direct benefactions, of increasing. Upon these parishes the present depression of agriculture has weighed very heavily : they were, as we thought, as poor as they could be before, now the chronic pressure has become acute. There are other livings, which, in the flourishing days of agriculture, were well endowed with glebe farms, which have been reduced to almost abject poverty by recent changes : these, from the impossibility of letting land and the impossibility of farming it to profit, are still in great distress. There are a good many livings, moreover, a considerable part of whose endowment consists of the large and handsome parsonage house, which the income of the benefice is not sufficient to keep up. And besides these local drawbacks, there are the usual weak points so often adduced, too early marriages, very large families, the diffi-

culties of education, the impossibility of adequate life insurance, the hardships of dilapidations, the awkwardness of adopting other means for eking out an inadequate income. I mention these points, rather to guard myself against the charge of neglecting them, than from any hope of offering such advice as may be helpful. And I venture to speak of them with sympathy, although I know that I shall be told, that as a Bishop with an assured and fixed income I cannot really enter into the troubles of the poorer clergy. I know that I shall be told so, and that it is not a sufficient answer to say either that I have not always been a Bishop with an assured income, or that Bishops with assured incomes have, like their poorer brethren, calls upon them which leave very little margin ; or that every Bishop really holds his assured income as a trust for making the best use of it, whilst there are many other purposes which call upon him for support, and which in ordinary cases have a demand upon him prior even to the duty of supplementing the needs of the clergy. Under present circumstances, the conscience of the Bishop must acquit him if it can, and I believe that it does ; anyhow, it knows more about the matter than those who devote themselves to calculate what appreciable benefit the Bishop's income would furnish if it were redistributed among the 647 benefices of the three counties. Let me just premise further, that I consider the proper income for a clergyman, irrespective of the demands that are likely to be made upon him by reason of the extent or poverty of his parish—the professional income, I mean—is such a one as will enable him to keep house, and to bring up his children and educate them in the same way that other middle-class people bring up and educate theirs—in the way in which he, we will say, was himself educated ; and that being granted, I think that I may infer, that there are very few livings that will enable a man to do more, a very large number in which without private means he will be very far from able to do as much.

Speaking now of the present distress, I would say, first, that as it is not by any means confined to the clergy, but extends to every portion of the great middle class, and, to

an extent little appreciated, to members of the higher classes connected with the landed interest, there must be some part of the burden to be lightened by the economies which other people are obliged to practise. There can be only a very few places where the clergyman's family is the only one obliged to confess that it must reduce expenditure. It is, I confess it, a painful thing to have to say, but it must be said ; it is most painful when one knows that expenditure is reduced by the very force of poverty—there need be no shame in confessing it. Economy must be regarded as a necessity, waste as a sin. Economy constitutes by itself a claim on those, and they are many, who could and would help those whom they see trying to make the best of things. I do not think the caution is unnecessary : if in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred it is all right, the hundredth case justifies me in saying it—carelessness about debt is both a crime and a blunder.

Speaking further of the livings which are impoverished by reason of the depression—for it is of such cases that I am now thinking chiefly, and it is of little use to recommend additional economy to the small incomes, which from the beginning enforce the habit upon their owners—speaking of the livings that have glebe and large houses, let me say that next to economy I recommend patience. There is a great temptation to sell glebe lands where they can be sold, and to let parsonage-houses where they belong to impoverished livings. As to the sale of glebe, for which recent legislation has given great facilities, I must briefly say that, as it stands to reason, where land will not let, it can only be sold at the risk of great permanent loss, except in cases so exceptional as scarcely to come into relation with the present problem. Where land can be well sold for building purposes, and where these building purposes are not merely speculative—that is, where local improvements are on hand and the requirements of increasing populations have to be met—there it is wise and advantageous to sell ; but where you are tempted to sell because the interest of the purchase money at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. would be greater than the rent at present obtainable, it would be unwise and disadvantageous

to sell. Under any circumstances, it is very inexpedient to do so without great caution exercised on the spot, as well as through those departments in whose hands the law has left the regulation of such transactions. I think, further, that it is generally unwise in agricultural parishes for the clergyman, by parting with agricultural property, to disjoin his temporal interests from those of his parishioners more than they are disjoined already ; such a separation of interests has been the one drawback, inevitable perhaps, but still a drawback, on the economic work of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and more recently on that of the Commissions for University Endowments.

As for the letting of glebe-houses—an expedient which has been tried in several parishes with no great advantage, I think—I would not be thought to wish to introduce a novelty, or to close an opportunity of help. The incumbent has, I believe, no restraint on his power of letting during the three months which are legally subtracted from his annual duty of residence. If he lets his house for a longer period, it is competent for the Bishop to recall him into his complete residence duty, and insist that he occupy the house. But where the duties are completely discharged by the incumbent, and he is resident in a smaller house, and where, by letting the large house, his income can be materially improved, I think that the Bishop may very wisely permit such an arrangement as a temporary remedy. In saying this, however, I must not be supposed to be giving a general dispensation. I think that each case must be still treated according to its merits ; and that it is right that the Bishop should be consulted, even when, as in the case of three months' letting, the clergyman is acting within his own power. I would urge that the greatest care should be taken in ascertaining the character and circumstances of the tenant ; mere birds of passage, even for a hunting season, are not always desirable parishioners, and a few weeks of bad influence in the parsonage-house may destroy the purity, peace, and comfort of a parish for years. And this consideration is further affected by the fact that the clergyman's terminable interest in his house, and the

formidable question of dilapidations, operate to his disadvantage as a lessor. Of course I recommend no such experiment, but there are cases in which, as a temporary relief, it may be tried, and I am very sensible of the exhausting process of having to live in a house much larger than one likes or wants. Anyhow, it is better than to try to fill your houses, and make up your incomes, by pupils whom you cannot manage, or the care of whom would distract you from the proper work for which you are placed where you are. After a long experience of clerical life in various positions, I may be excused saying, that for one case in which I have found a clergyman actually improving his position and satisfactorily doing his duty with more gain than loss to his parish by this expedient, I have found twenty in which neither parson, pupil, nor parish got any permanent benefit to counteract the risks, distractions, and neglects that are inherent in attempts to reconcile two engrossing and incompatible sets of engagements. As to this, however, as I have no direct control, I shall not offer more than advice, which advice I shall be quite glad to modify in cases which are exceptional, either for the capacity of the tutor or the smallness of the demands on his time, or the other special circumstances of his case—a point which you will kindly take for granted as applying to all that I have had to say on a subject which is altogether painful.

Life Insurance.

In connexion with it further, I would speak of another point which I would urge on the younger clergy direct, and on the elders, that they may inculcate where they have the opportunity—that is, the importance of insuring the life early. In these days, when, notwithstanding the poverty of the clerical profession generally, a young man begins life at twenty-four with an income of £120 to £150 a year, it is not too much to expect of him that he should insure his life, say, for £500 in a good office. It is little more than £10 a year, and probably not more than a week's or ten days' retrenchment of that six weeks' summer holiday which seems to be the lot of curates, so much more fortunate in

that respect than Bishops, rectors, and vicars. Such a payment simply helps as a nest-egg for future providence. If in a few years the curate gets a small living, it is a security for his dilapidations; if he marries, it is the beginning of a provision for those whom he must leave behind him when he dies, and, insufficient as it no doubt both is and appears in that function, it is a beginning, a reminder, a little comfort to conscience and spur to exertion. In a few years the value of the policy is largely increased, and possibly, as the duty becomes a part of the habitual economy of a sensible man, he finds means of increasing his reserve fund in this way. It is a great mistake to delay insuring until you are in a position to spare the annual premium without an effort or without economy. To ninety-nine out of a hundred that time never comes; to the one to whom it comes the cost is immensely greater, and sometimes, as years go on, it becomes a real burden fettering the liberty of the incumbent who knows that he ought to resign, and yet cannot do it safely without forfeiting the insurance which he has attempted on exhausting terms to secure.

And as I am saying so much on economies now, let me urge on all, clergy and laity alike, who are interested in this, that it is extremely desirable, by supporting the great charitable societies, the Sons of the Clergy, the Poor Clergy Relief, the Friend of the Clergy, and the county societies in the several archdeaconries, to further the subsidiary devices for helping the poorer members of our profession, perhaps our own wives and children in the distance.

Our own Times.

I suppose that, if any of us were called on to describe the character of our own times, we should say that they are trying times, and times of transition—a time when all things, men and institutions, are on their trial, and a time when everything seems to be in the process of change.

There are two matters now conspicuously and prominently before the mind of the Church which make very many of us anxious even to faithlessness, and impatient

even to the extent of uncharitableness. Of these I propose to say a few words of caution and counsel. Perhaps all that I can say will amount to no more than a counsel of patience and tolerance. On the first of these, the effect which may be produced by the assumed results of what is called the higher criticism of the Holy Scriptures, in their bearing on the details of dogmatic theology, and consequently on the sense in which the Articles of the Creed are to be explained, I will be very brief.

Higher Criticism.

The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament are now going through a process of analytical criticism which has, as we believe, had no parallel, for acuteness of investigation, carefulness of method, and completeness of apparatus, since the days in which they began to be regarded as a code of inspired literature, and certainly not since the days of our blessed Lord's life on earth; at which period we understand that to all intents and purposes the books which we receive as the Canonical Old Testament Scriptures had taken their existing form. This process of analytical criticism is producing, or assuming to produce, results which are very startling, altering the commonly accepted dates of some books, breaking up the accepted unities of others, and unsettling, disproving, the accepted authorship of others—results, one may say, in every respect remarkable, seeing that they interfere seriously with the literary and religious beliefs of 2,000 years, modify all definite theories of prophecy and revelation, and demand a readjustment, to say the least, of all existing religious theories of inspiration.

And this unsettling of matters which have been for all these years regarded as settled has the further result on the acceptance of the New Testament Scriptures, and even on the explanation of the language of our blessed Lord as recorded there. For if the literary and historical truth of the formation of the Old Testament code is irreconcilable with the statements of the New Testament writers by whom it is cited, it is difficult to acquit them of ignorance,

and, where they found arguments on the misunderstood theories of authorship, of an ignorance so dangerous as to bring their general credibility into question. And further than this, when our Lord quotes a passage from the Old Testament, and argues from it, on an acceptance of authorship which is now assumed to be disproved, His own credibility, and with it the divine and perfect knowledge which in His one personality He must, as we have been taught, have possessed, becomes a matter of doubt; and therewith the doctrine of the Incarnation, the complete union of perfect Godhead and perfect Manhood in the one person of the Son. Such a result is a very terrible one, very terrible indeed if we at all realise what it means: not only that Christianity is not proved, or that its doctrine of the Incarnation is false, but that a God who would let mankind be cheated of the truth by their own best instincts, and, by permission of a falsehood, delude them into a progress of development towards a virtue that has no real sanction as virtue and a hope of immortality that has no certain warrant, can scarcely be a God of love or truth at all. I have stated matters, of course, as you will understand, in the most extreme way.

We have often been told, when some startling novelty has been broached, especially in relation to religious theory, that opinion goes through three phases: first, the new truth is said to be destructive of the old; second, it does not make any difference; third, it is absolutely confirmative of the truth that it seemed at first to contradict. The formula is a cynical one, but there is this much of truth in it—it is the novelty that alarms, it is the amount of proved truth that confirms. So far we may accept it. It will pretty certainly be the result now, if we will wait and not let our impatience, by cutting knots that may and will be untied, spoil the opportunity, and encumber the faith of God with new difficulties and embittered relations.

At every step of the programme which I have stated, there arise considerations of questions which we are not qualified to answer peremptorily—we, ourselves, I mean, are not qualified; questions which neither alarmism on the

one hand nor terrorism on the other shall compel us to answer before the time. Possibly no human investigation ever can become competent for the task. Whichever end we begin at, we find the same disqualification. There are missing links, too, between every two sections of the destructive argument.

We are not all of us so well read in patristic theology as to be able to determine the exact bearing of the several theories that prevailed in the days nearest the days of the Son of Man, as to the relation between the divine knowledge which He possessed as God, and the measure of it which the human faculties which He possessed as the perfect man, were capable of realising and using : but we do know enough about patristic divinity to be aware that the theories of the Fathers were not all the same. Do not think that I am extenuating the importance of the matter ; but do not pass judgment on a matter on which, as on all questions of the relation of the finite to the infinite, and of matter to spirit, you, we, the whole Church, the whole world, may well stand in awe. Wait for the Lord.

Next, we are, none of us, in a condition to lay down a hard-and-fast rule about inspiration. Our Church has not done so : we are not called upon to do so. The theories which have been acceptable to one age have proved untenable by another. The analysis of the inspired writings is now generally assumed to have proved that there are matters on which the inspiring force did not coerce the ignorance of the inspired writer into truths which he was incapable of accepting or understanding, as in matters of history and science. Here, too, we may be thankful for what we have received : it is no proof of faith to refuse to believe until all else is made clear. Here, too, we may, as the Church always has done, afford to wait. More light may, will, come in time ; but the more is given to him who trims the light he has, and does not put his candle under a bushel, because, as yet, it does not lighten the far horizon.

Last, we are not many of us critics of Hebrew grammar or style, and we scarcely do wisely when we allow our

anticipation of consequences to hinder us from a fair, full, and free consideration of the labours of those who are. Surely we have faith enough to wait—faith enough in the work of the Son, faith in the experience of the Church, faith in the moral working of the government of the world, not to be impatient. We are not in the position of men who pervert St. Thomas's petition of anxious love into an expression of querulous doubt. And, although I would not say a word against the free use of critical power in all matters to which it can be applied, especially in those of which I am myself ignorant, I do know that criticism, like history, cannot afford rash conclusions; that critics differ even on points that seem to them essential; that the best critic allows always for the possibility of new light, and that the very newness of the light that is now startling us is in the mind of the wise an earnest, not of finality, but of a further instalment of better and more light by-and-by. We have seen the ebb and flow in other regions of criticism, why should we give the critic a super-papal function of appeal which he himself, if he is wise, does not claim?

Perhaps I have said more than enough: in your patience you shall win your souls; things will be made clear to those who stedfastly believe. They who seek another rock because their hold on the faith which they have received has been faint, loose, slippery—whether that rock be in the hardness of self-conceit, or in the self-assumed infallibility of a system that dispenses with the foundation of the scripture—they shall have great trouble. We ask God's mercy on those who seek some other rock than Him. We wait for His loving-kindness in the midst of His temple. Yes, we wait—but it is in the midst of His temple.

Ritualism.

I am now going to approach the question which to many minds appears to be the burning question of the day, what is commonly called Ritualism. It is too late now to protest against the use of the word, which, like almost every other word that ends in "ism," except, per-

haps, "schism," has its origin in misuse of etymological forms, and leads to inveterate prejudice. By ritualism, however, we all mean, now, the elaborate practice of rites and ceremonies—rites and ceremonies of which some are old and some new, some symbolical of doctrine and some not symbolical ; some symbolical of doctrine on which all Christians agree, others symbolical of doctrine on which great schools and ancient churches are at variance—rites and ceremonies which to one school amongst us seem a necessary exposition of the doctrine with which they are connected, and to others a hiding and obscuring of that which without such accessories would be patent and clear to all ; a necessary exposition, again, in one case of the doctrines which their upholders sincerely believe to be true, and which the opponents as sincerely believe to be a misinterpretation of the truth ; a necessary exposition in the other case of doctrines which, to the mind of one school it would be dishonest to conceal, and to the mind of the other school it is dishonest to maintain ;—rites and ceremonies, some of which, by long disuse, have lost their claim to be imperative, and which, by an apparently sudden revival, startle the ignorant and unprepared with an appearance of innovation that is pardonably repulsive ;—rites and ceremonies which have historically, legally, morally, and theologically, so varied and subtle and penetrating influences, as altogether in popular acceptance seem to outweigh their original and essential significance.

It would be perfectly useless if I were to say now that I am going to take an impartial and unprejudiced view of these bearings of the Ritual question—perfectly useless, first, because no one would believe it ; the violence of party spirit having long ago risen to such a pitch as to allow no impartiality to any judgment that is not on its own side. And secondly, because I know how unconsciously every man's judgment in matters in which by constitution, education, or experience, he is deeply interested, is influenced by what we can call by no other name than prejudice. All that I can say is, that I will try, whilst treating of the several sides of the subject which

I have indicated, to state matters of fact as matters of fact, and matters of opinion as inoffensively as I can state them.

(a) Ritual Changes.

The rites and ceremonies around which the contest circles, and the proper performance of which is the subject-matter of dispute, are the rights and ceremonies of the Book of Common Prayer, and especially that portion of it concerned with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Book of Common Prayer is the legal and formal expression of the mind of the English Church and nation, as to the celebration of the ordinances of the Gospel in public worship. It was drawn up at a period at which the controversies on the character of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper were particularly acute, and under a succession of influences which varied and were modified by other forces, but which were, throughout the period of consolidation, affected by this as a matter of crucial importance. We are able to trace in the successive editions of the Prayer Book the working of these influences; and the result may be briefly summed up.

Until the close of the reign of Henry VIII. the alterations made in the ancient service of the Church were small, had little reference to doctrine at all, except so far as the papal supremacy can be regarded as a matter of doctrine, and were chiefly important as indicating the movements towards change, which, whether owing to what was going on upon the Continent in the way of Reformation, or owing to the liberation of forces in England consequent on the breach with the Papacy, were certain to come, although it was not yet clear what line the changes would take.

The first measures of the next reign were distinctly of a mediating character. The Reform party, political and theological, was strong in the Court of the child-king, but the possibility of a combined administration of the old and new parties was not yet extinguished. The excesses of the extravagant and often outrageous partisans of Reform were restricted by legislation; but the constructive

measures of the statesmanlike leaders were determinately directed towards the abolition of the ancient abuses. The Communion Order of 1548 was a typical act of policy: with one hand it continued the old Ritual of the Mass, with the other it introduced the new Ritual of Communion in both kinds. It marks the nearest point of agreement—almost, one might say, of equilibrium—between the new and the old schools in the Church.

A year later came the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., which marks a very strong movement of the balance towards Reform. The new book is made up by a rearrangement of old materials, and by the introduction of much from new sources, harmonising well with the old material that was retained; the variations of service being, moreover, not so distinctly those that met the eye, as those which were intended to correct and adjust the doctrinal position of the worshipper. Many ceremonies that lay outside the contents of the Prayer Book were practically abolished or distinctly forbidden. The essential portions of divine service were presented in more simple guise; all incitements to or insinuations of idolatry were eliminated; but in its simple guise the new service was not so very unlike the old.

If the tendency to change could have been stayed there, a great deal of later history would have remained unwritten: but the elements at work were too strong, and the helm was not held in a steady hand. The old party mistrusted the change as a step in the direction of further change; the new party did not profess to consider it as final. Immediately on the realisation of this, a crisis set in. The conservative prelates, after some hesitation, refused to accept the changes, and were removed from their sees; as soon as that was done, a further reform was begun, and just at the close of the reign the second Prayer Book was published, and bore witness to the fact that the spirit of innovation had won a certain amount of victory.

The second Prayer Book, looked at so far as its material and doctrinal contents are concerned, does not differ widely from the first; the prayers and offices are to some extent

rearranged and readjusted; but the substance remains. The great changes are to be found in the outward and visible presentment of the services, about which still, notwithstanding the introduction of new influences, an amount of compromise or hesitation seems to linger. Was it quite intended to be final? This question cannot and need not be decisively concluded. It is possible that Cranmer and some of the more experienced scholars who took part in the work were satisfied with it, and might, if they had lived, have been inclined to resist further concessions to the school which was anxious to bring the English rite into direct agreement with the views of the continental Reformers; it is quite certain, from the conduct of the more advanced party under Elizabeth, that there was no finality in their minds on the matter. But it is to be remembered that the Calvinistic influence in England and Scotland was not yet so strong as within a very few years it became, and that it is quite possible, if Mary's reign had not intervened, that the changes might have gone much further. The period of persecution in which Cranmer and Ridley perished put an end to the possibility of a permanent compromise which would include under one rite the papal and protesting parties; and, at the accession of Elizabeth, the opportunity was given for consolidating and organising, on the principle of a National Church system, what had been secured by the action and reaction of the three preceding reigns.

The great historic importance of the third Prayer Book—that is, the one introduced by the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth, which to almost all intents and purposes is that which we now use—is that it was a distinct enunciation that the tide of innovation should proceed no further. The changes introduced into it from the second Prayer Book are very few, but, few as they are, they indicate a return to, rather than a further departure from, the first Prayer Book.

I do not propose to diverge now into any discussion upon them, but I may observe that from our knowledge of the views held by the Queen and her ablest counsellors, we

may not unreasonably speculate on a chance that, if the question of revision had come into the arena of practical politics, the tendency of such changes as they would have made would have been towards the earlier form of the book. That no such further revision was practically taken in hand was probably the result of the bitter attacks on the book as it now stood, which were made by the Puritan party inside the Church and outside of it. The intransigency of the one party forced the conservatism of the other into an attitude of inflexible resistance. Neither at the accession of James I. nor at the restoration of Charles II. were any concessions made to the Puritan party, and such modifications and sufferances as did affect the rites of the Church were, so far as they were more than matters of convenience, a strengthening of that order which the Edwardian Reformers had left behind them and the Elizabethan statesmen had accepted as a permanent religious basis—as in fact what we have now come to call the Reformation settlement.

Now it must not be forgotten that, besides the Puritan party outside the Church of England, a party which began to work in and out of Parliament as early as the reign of Elizabeth, there was a Puritan party within it which accepted the Prayer Book as a *modus vivendi* rather than as a symbolic book or confession of faith or guide of practice; and that, on the other side, besides the inflexible party of conformity, there were scholars and divines who were strongly drawn to the earlier usages in matters of ritual, although, in matters of doctrine, they agreed more than we should have thought likely with the Calvinistic and other Reformed Churches. So that through the whole period of which I have been speaking there was, together with a solid and firm front of opposition to Roman usurpations and Roman definitions, a school or set of divines and laymen who were inclined to develop such parts of the Church service as retained any flexibility in the direction of greater solemnity; and another school or set inclined to make the inevitable line of the Act of Uniformity the maximum of their ritual observance. Unquestionably these parties

diverged further from one another as time went on, as political events increased or diminished the chances of Roman influence, and as the study of the Holy Scriptures and Church history received more direct and devout attention on both sides. So matters stood towards the close of the seventeenth century ; events gradually complicating on one hand and simplifying on the other. The expulsion of the Nonconformist clergy in 1662, the intrigues of the politicians under the later Stewarts, the ecclesiastical strifes of the reigns of Anne and George I., altered the spiritual temperature of the Church, and changed the old matters of controversy for new ones. Whatever great things were to be done under the Hanoverian reigns were to be done in the resistance to Deism, and in the revival of the religious life of the people. These points are not relevant to my present purpose. As to ritual history, from the close of the Nonjurors' separation to the revival of fifty years ago, there is a blank. The services of the Church, where they were celebrated with any more elaboration than the simple decency which interpreted all order by common custom, were marked with parade of a secular character, and a certain development of sacred music, which was a common feature in all foreign communities, Catholic and Protestant, at the time, although not perhaps in Scotland or among the Nonconformists of our own nation.

(b) Ritual History.

Now it is well within the memory of a very large number amongst us, how the movement began which altered all this ; which threw off the lethargy under which Church life had been vegetating or hybernating for a time ; which began the restoration of our Church fabrics, restored the study of Church history, vindicated the claim of the Church to its educational and missionary functions ; and, kindling the fire of enthusiasm within the limits of the Church of England and without, helped to exhibit religious life in juxtaposition with the stimulated and developed social and political life of the period, as one of the great factors of character and history.

One of the first matters which marked the revival was the attempt to realise the whole bearings of the liturgy of the Church; and, as such an attempt was a most overt and distinct assertion of revival, it was met with the suspicion that always welcomes any policy that disturbs popular complacency. It came at a time when Church reform was understood to mean the reduction or alienation of revenue on one side, and the economy of resources and correction of administrative abuses on the other: and it came from a quarter which could no more acquiesce with the former than it could content itself with the measures of the latter. We can remember the struggles which attended the attempt to reintroduce the surplice into the pulpit, and how the simplest efforts to improve the arrangements of divine service were attacked as being insidiously intended to lead the congregations to the Church of Rome. The revival of rubrical observance, which I distinctly affirm had, at that time, no relation or reference, by connexion or intention, with Romanism, was designated as an overt attack on spiritual religion; any idea of making a change in custom so as to bring the service into obedience to the rubrics, was scouted as an innovation, and men were persecuted within the last forty years for doing things which an honest interpretation of simple words has now vindicated as legal, and made customary also.

Things have gone on moving. When once the subject was started, and its possible importance seen, its real value as a religious influence, and its incidental significance as an implement to be used in controversies which had revived as well as other elements of life, these things became a matter of careful study, of analysis, and of historical investigation; and, as our communications with the Continent were developed, a point of curious personal investigation to everyone who could go out and see for himself what the services in the French, German, and Italian churches were like. And as a consequence of this, men began to interpret the rubrics of our Prayer Book with reference not only to the stages of definition which I have characterised, but, as their studies drew them, by the illustrations to be drawn

from the pre-Reformation Service Books, and, as their personal experience of foreign travel drew them, by the devotional exercises and other phenomena of foreign usage. And this result was further complicated by the incessant fire of criticism, more or less ignorant, to which every marked clergyman or church was subjected. Irritation produced exaggeration; the sense of undeserved reproach, working on minds already unsettled in the old allegiance to the letter of the formularies, stimulated men to extravagances which were and are reactionary in the worst sense.

We have thus in simple terms two remote extremes and a good many intermediate variations. An extreme ritual Puritanism, an extreme of ritual extravagance: ritual Puritanism and ritual extravagance, of which it would be true to say that, consciously or unconsciously, they are alike disloyal. Between them are the stages which each extreme denounces as only extremes can denounce, but which themselves are separated by the same old line of separation which divided parties in the seventeenth century—the party which would, if it could loyally do so, go further in the direction of change, and the party which would content itself with upholding, and developing as far as it loyally can, the ceremonial observances of the Prayer Book in the direction of ancient usage. Into the minutiae of the differences I do not think it at all necessary, and it is certainly not expedient, for me to go. They are obvious to most men. Let it suffice to say that they are, very few of them, new points of divergence, and all to be easily referred to the varying action or permission of action which is covered by the latitude of ritual comprehension as symbolised in the liturgies of 1559 and 1662. Whatever seems to be outside of that latitude, in either direction, I do not want to characterise further; and it is not necessary for my present purpose to determine minutely the limits either way. That determination is the work of law and judicature: and the historical outline which I have attempted has led us up to the consideration, or rather the contemplation—for I do not propose any analytical treatment of it—of that as our next point.

Church Courts.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt, within the limits of a Visitation charge, to compress even into faint outline the details of history, theory, opinion, and experience on the matter of Church courts, qualified, competent, and capable of deciding on points of doctrine or ritual in such a way as would satisfy men who are working on diametrically contrary principles. What we want really is a supreme court, so well informed, so rigorously impartial, so equitably open to the consideration of practical questions, so careful in the elaboration of decisions, and so properly qualified to adjudicate causes on which the interests of human souls are believed to turn, that the loyal will obey its decisions with complete acquiescence, and the disloyal neither seek nor find ways of defying or evading them. The law of the Church of England is a law binding on the heart, mind, and conscience of the clergy, and they have a right to demand that the administration of the law shall be in the hands of men in whom, for such qualifications as I have enumerated, they are justified in having confidence. That demand being fulfilled in conscience as well as in justice, they are bound to obey the decisions of the courts, or to put themselves into such a position that they shall cease to be affected by them: that, I suppose, all will admit. But I must go further, and say that, even if the courts were not such as they could have perfect confidence in, still, so long as they are the courts established by the law of the land which maintains the clergy in possession of their property and rights, the alternative remains, obedience or punishment. This may strike you as a harsh pronouncement under present circumstances, but it is only a reduction to its lowest terms of the *ultima ratio* in all litigation.

Practically it is not accepted by all, and that for certain reasons which can only be briefly summarised. The supreme tribunal of appeal is not, according to the mind of many, so constituted as to possess the competency and capacity that is desired; its decisions are not consistent with one another, or with the historical and spiritual

conditions on which a tribunal of appeal should decide ; it has been used to close questions which ought, by reason of the latitude of the Reformation settlement, to have been left open ; it has not measured out justice equally to the two extreme contending parties ; and, where it has decided in favour of the party which has been attacked, its judgments have been so worded as to show suspicion and prejudice against those who, in their own idea, were contending for what they believed to be the law and legally justified. I do not allege these points as at all conclusive, but simply because I think that they explain the attitude of discontent which would appear otherwise unreasonable. The decisions of the Judicial Committee appear to the sufferers to be wrong, and they justify their disregard to them by questioning the competency of the court which gives them. Their demurrers are of unequal value, and some of them are raised on a theory that has no warrant. No tribunal, of appeal or other, can adjudicate on questions that are not brought before it ; and the Judicial Committee has never been asked to deal out impartial justice to the anti-ritual side. It is of the very nature of law to close questions which, on other considerations, might be left open. It is for history or for theology to determine the bearing of events and beliefs ; and, if there is no conclusion attainable, to leave them until something new arises to interpret them further : but law has to determine what is to be done. Truth—truth in possession or in expectation—is the object of historical inquiry ; decision, something to be done, is the object of legal proceedings. And if on such considerations it does seem unreasonable sometimes that legal decisions, based on imperfect information, should be incapable of review or reversal, such unreasonableness must be regarded as one of the trials of human patience, one of the conditions for which future legislation may supply, not indeed redress of the past, but opportunities for better things by-and-by.

If, with these considerations before us, we face the present difficulty, it is of no use to shut our eyes to the fact that, with two parties acting on different principles,

and the one being determinately set on driving the other to extremities, the situation is an extremely dangerous one.

And it is not the less dangerous because there are two ways of looking at it, when the result of both ways of looking at it is the same. It makes no difference, if a legal decision means the condemnation and forfeiture of the wrong party, whether the action is raised for the vindication of the rights of the prosecutor or for the correction of the soul of the defendant. The result is the same, and a series of such results in a uniform direction can have only one issue. That issue no rearrangement of tribunals, nothing short of legislative reform, if even legislative reform were possible or could do it, would avert.

Misrepresentations.

I will not waste your time with further speculation on this ; but there are still the moral and the religious side of the present disputes to be noted, and very briefly—possibly the same few words may do for both. Well, the moral aspect of the dispute has its importance thus : no sanctity of aim, no determination to vindicate even the highest law, justifies the use of means which are otherwise unjustifiable. Appeals to popular prejudice ; the use of misrepresentation ; the propagation of controversial antagonism among the ignorant and ill-informed ; evil-speaking, lying, and slandering, are unpardonable, whether in the mouth of a controversial divine, or in the columns of a religious newspaper, or in the little stinging paragraphs of a society journal. They would be unpardonable in the mouth of an apostle or an archangel. To accuse a man of disloyalty on speculative grounds, to accuse a body of men of conspiracy on speculative grounds, to accuse a man of dishonesty because he takes a different view of matters of doctrine or interpretation, is a self-condemnatory method of controversy. And those who teach the ignorant and prejudiced to misuse the vocabulary of controversy are not less sinning against their own souls. I am sick of hearing about sacerdotalism and mediævalism from men

who scarcely know how to spell the words, and who have been taught to misuse them by the very prejudice that construes every unintelligible accusation as a condemnation. I do not care if one party is as bad as the other, to modify my words of censure. These evil words and cruel insinuations harm most those who use them; but they wound the whole body of Christ. They are sins against that charity without which the profoundest and most perfect orthodoxy is no more good than sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. They are the weapons of the enemy of Christ, which they who allow themselves to use are *ipso facto* overcome of them. Morally looked at, they call out, stimulate, and exasperate the worst feelings of human nature; religiously looked at, they are most thoroughly opposed to the law and example and express teaching of the Saviour: ye know not what spirit ye are of, if ye use them, any of you. And they are the very crowning of the sin of schism, the forcible rending of the mystical body of the Lord. I tried to speak dispassionately of the material points of dispute about these matters: here there is no need to speak dispassionately; there is no question for doubt; burning indignation is not out of place.

And I should not except from this condemnation other exaggerated estimates, or expressions in exaggerated language, of the condition of the Church of England at this time; to speak of anarchy and lawlessness is, with reference to nine hundred and ninety-nine of every thousand of our parishes, a falsehood; and with respect to the one that is disordered, it is an exaggeration out of all proportion to the truth. I recognise the fact that there is a wayward wrong-headedness, a disobedience to a law that is unacceptable to the self-will of parties; but lawlessness means something far beyond that, and anarchy something remoter still. I recognise the sin of disobedience and wilfulness, as I recognise the sin of malignity and persecution; from both may He who holds the balance of judgment deliver us in His good time, and that soon.

Religious Education.

Although there are very many practical and debateable questions before the mind of the Church of England at this moment, there is not one, I think, that in either immediate urgency or permanent importance comes near that of popular education. Hopeless as it would seem to say anything new upon it, and grievously as it has become involved in the noise and turmoil of political complications, it is a subject which will not let itself be shelved as either worn out or inextricable. We have no right to be silent about it or careless about it; it is the question of life or death. It is pre-eminently one that calls for the exercise of moderation in judgment, and toleration of opposing opinions. It is one in which none of the really interested among the contending parties can hope for a complete victory, and it is one on which, if national impatience should sweep away all our contentions by one imperative mandate, all those who are really interested among the contending parties will be alike, if not equally, losers. And it is not a new question: in different phases it has been before thoughtful minds for nearly a century; for it was one of the very first matters upon which the awakened forces of religion and philanthropy, which were roused to energy by the shock of the great French Revolution, found material and interest to work. It means to us the future of our children, of our Church, of our country, of the world, in fact, in which our children, our Church, and our country are to have their work and mission. It means to us, further, the fulfilment of a duty which one age owes as a sponsor before God and in the view of history for the next age, a duty which, whether contemplated in its relation to God the Father, Son, and Spirit, or looked at in its bearing on the development of human progress, carries with it desperate condemnation to those who neglect it or content themselves in doing it any way less good than the best. It is a growing work, a growing duty, a growing responsibility.

It is worth while, at the cost of some little repetition of well-known facts, to look into the history of the subject.

We may possibly trace some permanent elements of difficulty, or we may regard the whole subject and its most distinctive features especially as the unexpected and unprepared-for result of events that at first sight seem to have little connexion with it. Either way there are some curious, many important, questions to be asked. England has been a Christian country for nearly 1,300 years; England has been enlightened with the agency of the printing-press for four centuries; England has rid herself of the blight of mediæval ignorance, as it is commonly called, for at least three centuries. Each generation has had something to teach the next: what itself learned from those that went before, and what by its own experience it was able to add to the lesson of tradition. There always were some schools, there always was some religious teaching, some elementary teaching, or we should not have been as we are, or as our grandfathers were when the new movements for education began at the beginning of the century. That means that there never was an age in which the preciousness of education was lost sight of, although there were ages in which the best means to the best end were neglected, and in which men were content to let the machinery for general transmission of what there was to learn, fall far behind the progress that was being made in other matters, such as wealth, mechanical skill, and political ambitions. And all through, religious teaching has formed a part of education, as if on the principle that, unless education was worked as a religious duty, there would be no sufficient motive power, either in general philanthropy or in political economy, strong enough to keep the mind of the age conscious of its duty to its successor. The conservative mind recognised education as a conserving element for that which it wished to conserve; the progressive mind recognised education as an indispensable part of the intelligence that was to direct and develop progress. Religion was an element in both ideas, although even religion failed to supply an adequate stimulus in lazy or merely speculative times. It was left for our own age to set to work vigorously, universally, and

compulsorily in the performance of the great duty ; and it is for our own age now to solve the problem of how religion, amid the turmoil and contradictions of schools, sects, theories, experiences, indolences, and zeals, is to continue to be taught ; or if not, on what terms it is to be eliminated. My own words suggest a question preliminary to any examination of the history. Can religion be taught at all ? There are people who say that it cannot, that it is the expression of spiritual feeling, which is valueless and useless unless it be entirely spontaneous ; that there are some in whom such spiritual feeling shows itself when they are children, and others in whom only the experience of life can evoke it, whilst for the great majority of men it either dies in the germ or never exists at all ; and thus that children had better not be committed to beliefs that they cannot understand, or trained in methods, formularies, and ceremonies that fetter the freedom with which their spiritual nature should develop. The whole theory is superficial, but it has the popular element of furnishing an easy way out of a difficulty. We can answer it by very simple analogies. We have all heard of the man who would not venture into the water until he had learned to swim ; the alphabet as well as the catechism must be learned by those who are quite unable to understand it ; all elementary teaching is a process from the condition of ignorance to the condition of knowledge, through media which are unintelligible at the beginning to be intelligible at the end. Music has to be learned through the mechanism of a training which is absolutely unintelligible to the child who goes through it. Religious feeling is not a matter of teaching, but the child may well be taught the lessons which, if any can, will evoke it, and must be taught the truths round which the religious feeling when it is aroused may circle. It is a very cruel thing to leave a child without the guidance that its very first spiritual instincts demand in their search for that God who has made it for Himself. If the child cannot be taught faith, hope, and charity, it can be taught the facts which, when the time comes, it can in faith embrace, and in hope work

for, and the rules of love which are to be, when it has learned to love Christ, the habits and instincts of a renewed nature.

But our notion of religious education is not merely an education in religion, but an education in all things that can be learned, given in a religious spirit, and in such a way as to teach the religious side and bearing of all human actions and studies. But I must go to the other side of the subject now.

It is scarcely necessary to inquire how people were educated in those early days in which book knowledge was a professional acquisition ; when ordinary people counted on their fingers, and no village contained a person who could read or write except the clergyman and the steward of the manor. Prayers and Bible lessons were learned by oral teaching in church ; and whatever of other elementary teaching was acquired, it was acquired by experience or by effort, carrying the learner away from his simple surroundings, to schools established in towns or monasteries, the teaching of which was still more or less professional. With the invention of printing the extension of schools began, but they were mainly grammar-schools, first-step schools in a set of grades that led up to scholarship, not such as furnished an indispensable preparation for the everyday life of ordinary citizens. And this went on as the rule after the Reformation, although from that time we do, I think, trace a growing divergence—as, for instance, in the cases in which cathedral statutes provide for the choristers a simpler and less literary education than is offered to the King's scholars on the new foundations. The seventeenth century saw the formation of charity schools on country estates and in large towns ; all, however, as I think, framed on a principle of benefiting the particular estate or locality, inspired by local feeling or definite religious duty, not forming a part of any general scheme or even idea of a scheme for general advancement. The growth of this idea would, I think, be properly referred to the knot of good men who, after the Revolution and in the reign of Queen Anne, set to work to found the great

religious societies. Their work in this direction, supplemented by the adaptation of charity schools to the humbler but more general purpose of elementary teaching, was all distinctly religious; it was on the lines of the Church's teaching; and the attempts made by the Nonconformists in the same way, attempts which had no sectarian element, I believe, in them, but which were sincere and generous, and always to be mentioned with respect, were alike works of religion and charity.

In the year 1811 the National Society was founded; the British and Foreign School Society was founded a few years earlier. The former was a distinctly Church Society, the latter a mixed one of Churchmen and Nonconformists. Both began their work with the idea of framing a general system; both worked zealously; but in a short time the National Society concentrated the working power of Churchmen, and became the representative of the Church of England in the matter of education. For more than twenty years the burden was borne without help from the State; each year an increasing number of schools and children were brought in, and in 1834, three years after the Reform Act was passed, the subject was taken in hand by the House of Commons. For five years, 1834 to 1839, a grant of £20,000 was made annually and divided between the two Societies. In 1839, under Lord Melbourne's administration, a general scheme of education was brought forward by the Government; the administration of the annual grant was placed in the hands of an Educational Committee of the Privy Council, and a programme of secular instruction, in which religious teaching had no definite place, was proposed. This passed the Commons by a small majority, but in the House of Lords, led by Archbishop Howley, was met with a series of resolutions drawn up by the Bishops and embodied in an address to the Crown. The address was presented in solemn form by the peers at Buckingham Palace. The answer given was unfavourable; but the Government scheme was so modified as to allow of its acceptance by the clergy, and from that date the position of the Church as the educator of the

people was fairly vindicated. The grants increased, and the system of inspection was developed from year to year for thirty years with unbroken success. Not, however, without many struggles, the history of which, familiar as it must have been to the elders amongst us for a long time, has in the view of later evolutions become very ancient. I do not wish to refer to the political complications which underlay the struggles, nor to the ecclesiastical undercurrents which more or less efficaciously helped to determine special crises. Nor need I attempt to point out how the controversies which centred in the Conscience Clause (as it was called) changed their character and aspect. The period may be styled the period of the sole energy of Voluntary and Denominational Schools, assisted and controlled on general principles of efficient administration by the Educational Committee, carefully inspected and receiving annually greater grants. The religious inspection of the schools of the Church, the creation of training schools and colleges for Church schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, the incorporation of the educational into the diocesan work, went on through these years of probation. And the results were great in their way. But they did not as results meet the demand, and public opinion was not patient enough to wait. Accordingly, in 1870, the existing system of rate-aided schools and school-boards was, after much discussion, created to supplement and work in with the existing denominational and voluntary system. We all know that under this combination a much larger number of children have been brought in to be educated than could have been by the more gradual extension of the voluntary system, and that owing to the great advantage gained by the rate-aided schools over those which were dependent on voluntary subscriptions, a sort of rivalry has been kept up, about which one may doubt whether the result will be the survival of the fittest. And in this rivalry the religious element has its place, because owing to the unfortunate action and interpretation of the Cowper-Temple Clause in the Education Act, it is generally held that distinctive religious formularies are not to be used in rate-aided

schools. Those religious bodies thus that have distinctive religious formularies, and the Church of England especially, are put to the very painful alternative—either the use of the formularies must be suspended or the benefit of the rate aid must be renounced. And the difficulty has been enhanced by several causes—as, for instance, by the express wishes of political theorists to bring the whole educational work into symmetry on the non-religious or undenominational principle; the hostility of Nonconformist bodies, which feel themselves competent to undertake the religious teaching of their children in the Sunday schools without distinctive teaching in the board schools, and the lukewarmness of Churchmen in supporting the voluntary system where the board-school system stands in anything like competition with it. Nor is this all: for under successive modifications of the code under which the Government inspection is worked and the grants are administered, there has been a limitation of the direct religious teaching in Church schools themselves; religious instruction has been in danger of being edged out by the teaching of subjects which have more direct effect on the determination of the amount of the grant. There is then at present, together with a very encouraging record of the number, excellence, and growth of Church schools, a very discouraging counter-influence in the difficulty of obtaining pecuniary support, of the hazardous emulation with the rate-aided system, of the depressing effect of agricultural poverty in country parishes, and of the political or quasi-political doctrinairism which is felt to be at work under the whole complication. And there is further the newer element of the idea of free, or, as it is foreshadowed in ministerial language, “Assisted Education.”

Let us look at these matters from the point of practical questioning. What must be the result of the elimination of religious instruction from elementary schools? Is the tendency of the time towards the extinction of denominational schools, and universal adoption of a rate-aided system? Can religious instruction be satisfactorily given without formularies? or can religion be adequately taught in unsectarian schools? Can morality be taught without

religious sanctions or appeal to religious constitution in mind, soul, and spirit? Our answer must be very short if I am to find time for a word on Assisted Education.

First, then, my belief is that unless there is a much more concentrated and continued effort to sustain the voluntary system, there is imminent risk of its being swamped by the rate-aided system. There is a decided difference between driving your own carriage and availing yourself of the railway train, and the tendency is towards the universal prevalence of the latter. It is very likely that our policy is rather to improve the railway service than to cling obstinately to the use of our own equipage. It should be possible for a country like ours, a Christian, a denominational country, to improve its educational system into a truly national, not merely a sectarian or unsectarian system. If that is not done, if the voluntary schools are to be swamped by the board schools, what is to become of the religious teaching, and what are the moral consequences?

The prohibition of distinctive formularies, of Church teaching, means practically the inculcation of the idea that what the Church teaches her children as necessary to salvation is not necessary to salvation; it means the proscription of the doctrinal as well as the formal teaching of the Gospel. Non-inclusion is prohibition, and prohibition is practically contradiction. The exclusion of conformity is the inculcation of nonconformity. I need not appeal to recent events that are in the memory of us all as illustrating this.

The attempts, I believe next, to inculcate moral lessons without religious sanctions or appeals to motives and feelings which are distinctly religious, can only result in the inculcation of economic morals—that is, the cultivation of the virtues that lead to social success, good character, and the maintenance of credit; they cannot reach the heart or conscience, or help the training in faith, hope, and charity, or in the renunciation of those sins which do not bring with them disgraceful conventional consequences.

I am inclined to believe that, so far as we have now got,

the results of non-religious teaching have been saved from being thus non-religious by the fact that the great body of teachers has been religiously educated, and that in the great majority of homes religion is an influence greater than the outward profession of it would indicate : but that as time proceeds, unless a corrective be discovered and applied, the mischief must extend, and the tendency will become more decided.

Lastly, I believe that religion may be taught in the narrowest sectarian schools, however inadequately ; and that the morality resulting from even inadequate teaching—and all religious teaching is in a manner inadequate—will be essentially deeper and better than that which is inculcated under merely social sanctions. And I would therefore, in case it came to a matter of such choice, rather support the humblest school in which the Gospel of our Lord was taught according to the light of the sect, than I would the most complete system of education in which it was ignored. And if I am told that I am an unmitigated sectarian, I will answer, I am sure I do not care.

For the present our duty seems to me to be to strain every nerve to sustain the voluntary system, and to watch for every opportunity of making a truly national system possible : a sufficiently wide policy you will think, but one on which it is not specially difficult to act, if our heart is firm and our eyes open.

Assisted Education.

And now, finally, for Assisted Education. About this, notwithstanding all that has been said and written about it within the last year or two, we are still a good deal in the dark ; and in what I am going to say now I shall be unquestionably open to the criticism, that as I really know little about it, I am rather trying to instruct myself in thinking out one or two aspects of the matter than contributing any worthy element to a most important discussion. And I may perhaps as well preface what little I have to say with a statement of the practical conclusion to which I am certain to come ; that is, the advice to all,

that we should not commit ourselves to a hostile conclusion on the point, and that we should not, until much better informed than we now are, commit ourselves to any definite plan for carrying into effect such a scheme or portion of a scheme as seems *à priori* most likely to reconcile itself to our ideas of fitness in relation to it. With such a caution we can afford perhaps to speculate a little.

Any scheme of free or assisted education must, by the very force of the term, imply a gratuitous provision of some part or of the whole of the education of some part or of the whole of the population. Our first question would be, Is there anything in such gratuitous provision that is calculated to derogate from the dignity and value of education itself, or to damage the parent's idea of responsibility for his children's training and welfare, or that is humiliating or demoralising to the classes that are expected to take advantage of it?

As to these points, I think that we may safely return a ready negative. The dignity of education depends not on what it costs, but on what it is ; its value depends on its effects, not on its antecedents ; the parent's responsibility can be exercised in other and better ways than in the mere payment of fees. If there is anything humiliating or demoralising in accepting a free gift of the kind, it is a humiliation that a very great many of us have gone through without knowing it : for surely a very large number of public men and useful men have in the free schools and liberal provision of college founders and benefactors received the education which has fitted them for their positions. I will not venture to call myself a useful man, but here I am, owing every step and item of my own education and start in life to the gratuitous provision of former ages or continued benevolence of more modern institutions. There is nothing more humiliating in accepting such provision from public than from private or quasi-private sources. We look back on the history that I have sketched, and see how the early attempts to meet the want were attempts inspired and carried into effect by charity in free schools. We know, many of us by costly experience,

how very small an element of school expense the children's pence in small schools really is. We think, some of us perhaps, that in the reconstruction of the endowed school system within the last thirty years, too little weight has been allowed to the claims of the class who might have seemed the fittest recipients for local benefactions of the kind, and that the education of the poorest class amongst us might more generally than has been the case be thrown upon the considerable funds that have been readjusted in the grammar-school endowments for the benefit of the middle classes. Something I am willing to allow for that, although I know that it is a question which has many ramifications, and believe that the general result has been everything that was desired.

Against such an experience I do not think that the generalisation, "People do not really care for an education that costs them nothing," can be of a moment's weight. They, or such of them as have opinions worth considering, do set a high value on what education buys, the advancement, the development of the powers, the chances in social and substantial success which their children are likely to gain by it, even if they are too much depressed, or too indolent, or too much the creatures of habit to value or to desire such advantages for themselves. Nor, I think, can we allow more than a very little weight to the impression that the parent's notion of responsibility may be impaired. We shall be sorry if it is ; but the outlook is not for the parent's sense of responsibility, but for the future life of the children, their prosperity and happiness, in which matters the Church of Christ spiritually, and the State of England temporally, stands not so much perhaps *in loco parentis* as in the character of a parent with a higher range of duty and a stronger sense of responsibility than the natural parents can. The Church and State, the religion and the government, of this century are a sort of godfather and god-mother of the next. I would put the matter, however, more solemnly to the members of the Church of England and to all others who desire to see England continuously flourishing, great, and Christian. *Salus populi*, in this sense, is

suprema lex. The bodies and souls of the children are of more price than the prejudices and misinformed consciences of the parents.

But how about the means and ways? Here we get on an altogether different plane. How much education is to be assisted? and how is it to be paid for?

Elementary education since 1870 has been compulsory—it has been costly: the payment of school fees has been compulsory in a sense even when and where they were paid by the Boards of Guardians. This compulsion has enforced education up to a certain point, or to a certain age. Beyond that point and age the progress of the child and its continuance at school have been decided by different considerations. We ask, How much of the elementary education is to be free? All that is now compulsory, or all that is now optional? If it is that which is now compulsory, it will put a premium on that parental economy which we all want to discourage, of making education as short, and the wage-earning capacity as early, as it can be made. If it is that which is now optional, it will not meet the demand, to meet which the project now in contemplation has to be drawn. Can we split the difference?—lay down the rule that all children must remain at school up to a certain age, but must in certain subjects have their education free, and for certain subjects pay fees? That would relieve the careless parent, and mulct the careful one. Can we make the free education a matter of competition, as in the great public schools is now done by scholarships? Nay; I think not. Surely in this field we want to help those most who are able to help themselves least.

Well, I am not an expert in these matters, nor, I imagine, are many of you; and until we have a definite scheme before us, we do wisely in not committing ourselves to more than a general principle, and that is, that it is most desirable that all the education that we can offer shall be as good as it can be, and as wide in its operation; that it shall be offered to all who are in need of it, and that its bestowal shall be dependent on a general and central

management established on a principle or principles, and not on the changes and chances of local administration ; that the education shall be as good as it can be to be free, and as free as it can be to be good. It may be so free as to be good for nothing ; it may be so good as to be free to no one. It is for the experts, the statesmen, the practical workers to strike the balance, and to reconcile growing theory with improving practice.

One point more: we may be very sure that however free and however thorough the State education of the future may be, the religious education of the people will not be provided for by grants from the Consolidated Fund or from local rates. The very utmost that can be asked will be liberation from the restriction that at present fetters religious teaching in the board schools, and the permission to make it at least an optional subject. The utmost that can be expected will be a recognition of the fact, that the present proscription of formularies is an unwarrantable fettering of religious liberty which somehow or other ought to be removed. I do not want to raise difficulties new or old: my practical conclusion on the whole matter is that no change in this or any other direction is in the least likely to relieve the clergy or Churchmen generally from any part of their responsibility in caring for the religious education of the children ; but that, on the contrary, whilst we may hope that the effect of such new schemes as the one proposed will be to remove stumbling-blocks, that very making clear of the highway will be to increase our opportunities, and therewith stimulate, I trust, our earnestness in providing for the care and tuition of those of whom He who loves us and them so well tells us that their angels do always behold the face of the Father who is in heaven.

The New Code.

I ought to say a word or two about the New Code in conclusion. I believe that all the managers of voluntary schools may wisely welcome it as a boon. It certainly eases the working of the inspection system very consider-

ably, and promises to increase the equable and equitable treatment of the teaching staff as well as of the children in the schools. But we must not for a moment lose sight of the fact that no amelioration of code will compensate for lukewarmness or want of energy in the promoters of voluntary and denominational education—and that no increase of pecuniary grants ought to have the effect of relaxing the careful exertions of those who wish to see the next and future generations religiously and virtuously brought up. We are sometimes tempted, because the two principles of voluntary education and religious education are now working together, to confound them in their essential character. Voluntary administration and religious education are not the same thing. It may be a work, a noble work of Christian benevolence to sustain a system of elementary education that is worked by voluntary agency, even if that voluntary agency is largely assisted from the public funds; but the essential point with Christian people is not so much that the working be voluntary as that the teaching be Christian—and for members of our Church, that it be the teaching of the Church of England. I am sure that that is the feeling of all who are helping in Church schools; if it were not, if it were merely the idea of economy that keeps us back from the school-board system, I should doubt whether the holding back were either useful or likely to be lasting. From the other point of view I have no doubt or hesitation. The future of religious education depends on our determination that the education shall be religious; and, if that determination is to be more than mere bravado, it involves action as well as determination—more co-operation, more liberality, more personal labour, and more generous appreciation of the needs and exertions of our neighbours. After dwelling so long on the subject, I will only add a strong recommendation to make use of the machinery now devised and working in populous places—by the means of Church School Boards or School Councils of Education. These co-operative institutions will, I trust, soon be generally active amongst us, and will take in hand both the sustenance and

the improvement of the existing system. If the rich parishes can assist the poor parishes, the large assist the small, the forward help on the backward ; if the managers of neighbouring schools can compare notes, see where and how improvement is wanted, and where the means of improvement may be sought and found ; if this can be, by ruridecanal or archidiaconal boards acting with the diocesan boards, economising money and labour, and developing the work according to the exigencies and opportunities of times and places—we shall have a sound warrant for believing in our ultimate and entire success. Anyhow, I commend the whole subject, in its several and contrasted bearings, to the prayers and earnest consideration of clergy and laity alike.

Lambeth Conference (1888).

The chief event that has marked English Church history since the last Visitation is, of course, the Great Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican community, which was held at Lambeth in June and July, 1888.

It was a sight in no way outwardly remarkable to see 150 clergymen of various ages from thirty-five to eighty-five met in so ecclesiastical a place as Archbishop's Juxon's Hall ; although when you looked closer at them you could see that every one had his mark of character, something that designated him as a man whom men trusted, and who himself trusted in God. There were Bishops of all sorts : men of dignity, men of energy, men of experience, men of theory, men of practice, men of obviously great ability, men of modest and quiet authority, men of speech, and men of wise silence. There was not one who had not some share of all these, some mark more or less clearly defined. All were shepherds of God's people. They came from every quarter of the globe, and in a way represented the churches of every land in which the English flag flies or the English tongue is spoken, or English energy has made its way. Each had had his personal training, and none had come by any royal road to the place to which God had called him. On the individuality of each, local

or national influences had had their several bearing, and contributed an element to the diversity of experience and training that might have issued in party, class, national, scholastic, personal divisions, and which in the result marked most conspicuously the substantial unity and harmony of spirit which was at work amongst us. Of those Bishops some few, even of the greatest, have been taken from us during the short time that has intervened; in particular the Bishop of Durham, who in the leading part which he took in our deliberations, and by the authoritative wisdom, unwearied attention, and elaborate work which were apparent in every word he said, and every line he indited in connection with the Conference, showed himself a very chief in counsel, pre-eminent in ability and service, as in learning and devotion.

Well, these 150 met, prayed together, spoke to one another as brothers, yes, as more than brothers in the realisation of their membership of the one body: they conferred together and uttered their minds with no reticence, and formulated their propositions, and joined in their final utterance, and went back to the ends of the earth strengthened in heart and sympathy, in experience of the faithfulness of Him who had called them together. The mere fact of their meeting and parting as they did was a great thing: for whilst the brotherly kindness, the essential spiritual unity that marked the occasion, was most real as well as conspicuous, there was no doubt, nor any wish to conceal the fact, that all were not of the same way of thinking on some of the points that within the liberty of the Anglican community serve to set men and parties against one another, sometimes in antagonism that verges on bitterness. There was no bitterness, however, there; men might well agree to differ on questions which admit of no categorical solution, being united in the faith and confidence in Him who in His own time will reveal all truth to the true-hearted. And there was no assumption, no attempt to assert for the Anglican Churches a position which by the assumption condemned other communities; we were not called together to judge or to condemn, or

even to tell those that were without our border that they were without it. But there was no blinking of responsibility; we did not underrate our own calling or our own mission, because there might be, and we would not deny that there are, other callings, other missions, other Churches, other commissions than our own. So we tried to formulate no new articles of belief, or rules of order, or rites of worship; simply to hold fast that which we have received, trying to realise what we have, in the belief that, to such as do so, more is given. But we set before ourselves certain things to be said, to be said in judgment, and in prayer, and in our measure of courage, in confidence in Him whose ministers we believed ourselves to be; certain things, not a confession of faith, or syllabus of teaching, or programme of reconstitution, but a denunciation of evils that are to be fought against, and a body of counsels for work against the evil and for the good, of patience, charity, and extended work. This body of counsels was promulgated in the encyclical letter, which has long been in the hands of the clergy, and which the laymen of the Church might do well to try to master, if they would understand the real mind of the ministers and pastors to whom the real issues of life and death do perhaps present themselves more clearly and vividly than what are called the burning questions of Church politics that divide secular or quasi-secular opinion. Most of these real things lie deeper and outside the area of small questionings, such as we see discussed in the papers and talked of in railway carriages and vestry meetings. Besides these, there were a few matters touching Church constitution and order which, as of convenience and tending to promote more easy and cordial communication between the Churches, were thought worthy of special treatment.

There were thirteen committees of the Conference, and nineteen sets of resolutions resulting. The encyclical letter may be analysed under the same number of heads. Out of these, for my present purpose, I shall leave unnoticed those which concern the relations of the Anglican Churches to ancient and foreign communions (ii., iii.), that

on the relations of diocese and branches of the Anglican communion (ix.), and that on the care of emigrants (xii.), so far as they do not touch upon other work which I shall have to notice. Of the rest, that on Temperance, that on Purity, those on Marriage, one on the Lord's Day observance, are of such general interest, and the recommendations about them are so well known and, I trust, worked amongst us, that I need not treat of them at length. Of the others I shall speak in short detail. I will satisfy myself with indicating the mind of the Conference on the first four, only, however, so far as they are concerned with the aspect that these questions take in our own diocesan working.

Temperance.

1. With reference to the great question of Temperance, the only point which I need call attention to is that which connects itself with the doctrine of the dual basis of the Church of England Temperance Society, which has, through the work of the excellent founder and advocate, Canon Ellison, been so much discussed in this diocese. The Committee of the Conference urges: "The burden of the work must be borne by those who are willing to abstain entirely: those who are brought much into contact with intemperance should arm themselves with this weapon of total abstinence in their own persons. Wherever the battle is of exceptional importance, or forms for the time the first duty imposed on the clergy, total abstinence should be the weapon employed." Total abstinence, however, is not pressed as a moral duty on all, nor even as a counsel of perfection, nor as anything that is by itself of merit. "All are bound to help the weak in their battle with intemperance, but not all to help them by total abstinence in their own persons." The practical conclusions seem to me to be warranted not only by experience, but by their own inherent reasonableness. I need hardly mention the incidental resolution passed against the use of unfermented material as a substitute for wine in the administration of the Sacrament—a practice

which not only impairs the observance of our Saviour's own institution, but amounts practically to the Communion in one kind, a point about which so much of the Reformation struggle was directly concerned.

Purity.

2. The Report of the Committee on Purity, which was, I believe, mainly the work of the late Bishop of Durham, is a beautiful and touching document, and pledges the Bishops to confer with the clergy and laity on the wisest steps to be taken for the accomplishment of that reform which is so urgently needed. It enumerates several points, eight in all, upon which, as a basis of consultation, general action may be set on foot. I would commend these points especially to the consideration of those who are working systematically upon the matter in hand. The treatment of the subject is extremely hazardous in all but the wisest hands. The very exposition of the evil and its remedies is liable to the danger of suggesting that which it is undertaking to prevent or counteract. The very dwelling of the mind of the earnest worker on such a subject is liable to the risk attendant on all engrossing matters of meditation. Public discussion is open to the danger of making the young and innocent familiar with the details of sin. There are great risks in any organisation for working with the evil. Sermons to men, or sermons to women, books on purity, questions for self-examination—whatever experiment you like to mention, all abounds with difficulty. The very education that is directed to keep purity before the eye as an ideal to be worked to, the very caution that is intended to keep the knowledge of uncleanness out of the sight of the young, provokes a curiosity which is in itself more dangerous than the familiarity with revolting grossness. Still, our work is given us by Him who knows what is in man, and our strength is given us for the work. I shall trust that all who set themselves specially to deal, whether in societies, or single-handed, with this festering sore, will act on the principles which the devout and holy man who drew up the report I am speaking of has so formulated for us.

Divorce.

3. I need not speak in detail at all on the report or resolutions on divorce. As a matter of fact they are really no more than an enunciation of accepted principles. The evil with which they are concerned is, as is obvious, one phase of that of which I have just been speaking. Such remedy as we in our own sphere can wisely apply to the cure of the relaxation of public sentiment on the matter is, I think, rather to be found in the realisation of the sanctity and holiness of marriage than in invective against a law of divorce for which we are in no wise responsible. In all such material the law of the Gospel is, "Overcome evil with good." Purity itself is most powerfully advocated by the pure lives of those who desire to work up to the model "as He is pure"; and those in whom that love of the pure is well grown, will, as a very natural operation of their spiritual being, turn away from that which is evil, until to the pure all things are pure. The question of heathen polygamy, which, in the deliberations of the Conference came close on the treatment of divorce, need not occupy us now. But the general principle that marriage, as the basis of all social life, and consecrated to us by the excellent mystery that is betwixt Christ and His Church, should be set before ourselves and our people, not as a mere conventional or economical arrangement, as an expedient for the maintenance of the world, or as a remedy against sin, but as a holy calling ordained by God for the perfection of human happiness in innocence in this mortal life, is a matter which cannot safely be neglected, that need not be blinked, and that no reticence need be allowed to obscure.

Sunday.

4. The Sunday question, which is becoming more and more a practical problem, especially in our riverside parishes, was treated very briefly by the Committee which reported upon it. They recognised that there is a growing licence as to observance, and urged that the increasing laxity of the wealthy and the increasing encroachments on

the rest of the servants and others engaged in places where service is called for, are points in which guarded action should be taken. The difficulty of dealing with this subject is peculiar, and is peculiarly aggravated by the fact that Sunday observance has in this country acquired or preserved a character almost exceptional in Christian lands. And this to such an extent that to many, individuals and classes, a strict Sabbatarianism has become the most real, as well as outward and visible sign of religious life, a conscience to them for themselves and their neighbours, the test of their religious sincerity, which gone, all the rest is in danger of being lost. The existence of this feeling makes the matter one of great tenderness in the hands of those who, whilst fully believing in the sanctity of the day and desirous of its religious observance, still would desire to relax the sternness of obligatory idleness, by amusement or instruction that would be sanctified by wholesome use. We cannot thus safely defy what to us is an exaggeration or a prejudice, even in order to promote a more real and rational consecration of the day. And it is all the more difficult when we are hampered by the self-indulgent and defiantly irreligious conduct of those who set the law of observance altogether on one side, and make the day of God a day of luxurious entertainments, a burden to their servants, and a temptation to their neighbours, a stumbling-block in the way alike of the ignorant and prejudiced, and of the intelligent and earnest-minded of the clergy and laity, who, knowing that it is a day the Lord hath made, would make it a day of joy and gladness in the right way.

The remaining topics on which I have set myself to speak are three: the question of Home Reunion, that of Socialism, and that of authoritative standards of doctrine and worship.

Reunion

In reference to the first, what the Conference did was to pass a resolution proposing that the Anglican communities through their constituted authorities should make it known

that they were ready to confer with the representatives of other Christian communions in the English-speaking races in order to consider what steps can be taken either towards corporate reunion or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic union hereafter. Four articles were set out as a basis on which home reunion might be approached—the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, the acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the two Sacraments of the Gospel, and the historic episcopate. And a supplementary resolution urged the dissemination of information as to the standards of doctrine, worship, and government, among the several religious bodies of the English-speaking races.

It is not for me now to characterise or to criticise these resolutions, or the way in which they were received by the Nonconformist Churches and their representatives when they were made public; much less the answers which were made to the announcement which the Archbishop of Canterbury made to the various bodies interested. What I have to say must be on the general principles that underlie both the resolutions and the replies.

It appears to me that the articles of basis constitute the one side of a concordat which states the very minimum of what the Church of England could advance, without a practical renunciation of her own vital position. The historic episcopate, not merely as a method of Church government—in which sense it could scarcely be called historic—but as a distinct, substantive, and historical transmission of the commission of the apostles, in and by which our Lord formed His disciples through all generations into a distinctly organised body or Church—the historic episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England; and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion. And the assertion of such a principle involves either the admission to Holy Orders by the Bishops of all presbyterian or otherwise ordained ministers who are desirous of being united to us, before we could recognise their position or join their services with ours. To make this

demand appears to me to be somewhat unreasonable: the very essence of presbyterianism is presbytery, and the essence of historical presbyterianism is the negation of historic episcopacy. To expect reunion on a basis which means with one of the two parties a renunciation of its essential principle, seems, I say, unreasonable and unpractical. In saying this I must not be understood as meaning more than I say. There are presbyterian Churches with a historical succession of great authority and completeness. In affirming our historic episcopate I am throwing no doubt either on their constitutional consistency, or on their spiritual work. God has many ways of doing his work, and because I maintain that we have one of His ways in our Church, I am not to be said to maintain that that which is in use in Scotland, we will say, is not of His ways; or that other ministrations than ours are dead and useless. If I wanted to say so, or thought so, I should not be deterred from saying it by mere considerations of convenience. In the same way, the enunciation of the law of the Sacraments, in the third of the articles of basis, seems to require on the part of the Baptists a renunciation of their essential principle—the principle upon which they and their forefathers justify their separation from us, the principle around which their corporate existence is gathered, the principle in which their historical experience and all the conservative instincts of their ecclesiastical personality are constituted and conserved, the principle, in fact, which by the working of these influences has become so much a part of their religious and even spiritual life, that it could not be surrendered without a shock that would unsettle all that is fixed and firm in them. Of the other two articles, the sufficiency of Holy Scripture and of the two creeds, I need not speak in the same sense; for as to the first no Christian community or Church that could come within the contemplation of a scheme of reunion would deny it, and as to the second, there would be difficulties of concordant interpretation analogous to the lines of division which I have noted in reference to the third and fourth.

If I were discussing a scheme for reconstituting a national

religious establishment which should be concerned with endowments and jurisdictions only, I should have to take in further the position of Roman Catholics and Unitarians; but the case is different here, where spiritual unity and religious co-operation are in question, and I need not go beyond the lines of the resolution.

Am I then to be understood to be objecting to Home Reunion altogether, or as desirous to check the efforts of those who are working towards it, or as despairing of any practical result of the earnest prayers and efforts of God's people in this land after unity? Far from it. I believe that the want of unity amongst Christians is the great obstacle to the final victory of Christ's kingdom in the world. I believe that the principle of His prayer for such unity, that the world by the unity of His believing people should know that the Father hath sent Him, lies deep in the hearts of all who love Him and His Church. I believe that no sacrifice short of the sacrifice of the truth that He has revealed to us, and that we believe ourselves to have received in the way in which we have realised it, would be too great to make for the securing of that unity. But I believe that He has caused or suffered us and our dissentient brethren to be led by different ways to the truth, or the measure of it that we have been led to, and that we have no more right to anticipate His time of reconciliation by asking them to give up theirs than we have to give up our own. In His due time, I believe, the unity will come; but it will not be by mutual sacrifices of reality and sincerity. It will not be secured by illusory projects of comprehension.

But there are two points more. First, there are many matters of duty and privilege in which religious people and religious bodies can co-operate—co-operate not for confusion, but for order and toleration and resistance to evil. We can combine for all works of material usefulness—for hospitals, and the relief and help of the poor, for resistance to prevailing forms of corruption, for temperance, for the defence of the law of marriage, and social and personal purity. We can combine to secure for one another fair treatment in educational matters. Where we cannot join

in administrative work we can join in efforts to secure for each other administrative freedom and fair treatment. Wherever we can agree to differ, we can agree to the weapons and laws of lawful emulation.

And secondly, we can try to understand one another better. Not in cliques and parties courting favour with sections by minimising differences and sinking principles, but by putting before one another the true nature of our respective claims, the true agreements on which we maintain our distinctive tenets, and the true and genuine feeling which all real Christians feel or try to feel for all those who aspire to be recognised by that great name. In the furtherance of this design, I trust more to the progress of religious education in its elementary and higher aspect, than to any other influence, social or legislative. As men's minds widen they must become more capable of appreciating the varying aspects of truth and the various experiences and results of historic training. But here I must leave this point now. And I have said so much upon it that I must abridge what I have to say on the other points into a very few remarks.

Authoritative Standards.

I take the question of Authoritative Standards first, because it connects itself directly with that of home reunion. Our authoritative standards, loosely stated, are the Holy Scriptures, the three creeds, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Thirty-nine Articles. These stand in the closest connexion: the Scriptures, as the sufficient guide of faith and depository of spiritual truth; the creeds, the concentration of the faith and truth revealed in the Scriptures; the Prayer Book, the expression in public devotion, and more or less in private devotion also, of the intercourse between God and His Church and people, holding that faith and truth; and the Thirty-nine Articles, containing a formulated, somewhat scholastic, statement of the leading points in the Church system, arranged for the determination of our position and relation to existing communities which have had a different history from our own. All

these, and our relation to them severally, have been long before the world and the Churches. But it has been felt that in these days of hurry and of increased intercourse, and of improved education, there is room for a shorter declaration of the truths on which we stand than the Thirty-nine Articles, one more ready to hand than can be secured by a careful study of the Book of Common Prayer and Articles together, and one that would be relieved from the incidental and temporary conditions that make the Articles in some points appear to be a distorted or exaggerated, too general or too minute, presentment of the confession of a great Christian Church.

You may remember the attempt that was made a year or two ago to obtain the assent of Convocation in our province to a few questions and answers on the subject of the Church. Something of the same kind is wanted for the representation of the essential points of our confession and standards before other Churches and for the instruction of simple believers. I believe that it will be undertaken in an honest, comprehensive, and loving spirit; and that under God's gracious help it may be used for much good. But both the composition and acceptance of such a symbolic utterance is embarrassed by the mutual mistrust and suspicious attitude which religious partisanship has long nurtured amongst us, amidst which the very most elementary lessons of the Gospel seem to be forgotten—"Charity thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." May God help us in both work and word.

Socialism.

The last of the reports to which I will ask your attention is that on Socialism. I will call your attention to it without commenting on its contents, restricting myself in what I am going to say to another perhaps transient but at present very important aspect of a very important question. There is much socialism in the air of these times: there is a political socialism, and a religious socialism, a class socialism, and a sentimental socialism; a socialism whose law is

the bearing of one another's burdens, and a socialism whose practice is the playing fast and loose with one another's rights. We have heard a great deal of the war between labour and capital; and in the history of the dock disputes last year and this there have been incidents more than sufficient to call out sympathy and to inspire serious misgiving. But my question now is: What is the duty and policy of the clergy and Christian laity who are not directly and personally connected with the actual disputes?

The first point is one ludicrous almost in its simplicity. Let everyone learn the simple principles of political economy; let every clergyman so far qualify himself for beginning to form a capacity for judging of the matter, not accepting the principles of political economy as divine or necessary truths, but as representing the beliefs and motives upon which those who take part in these controversies believe themselves to be acting, and according to which they would be content to be judged.

The second point is a little deeper, do not, as religious men and clergymen, identify yourselves with classes or causes that are not distinctly and directly religious, so as to disqualify yourselves from doing your duty to those who are of the other classes or other causes. You are the servants, not only of the poor, not only of the rich, not only of the capitalist, not only of the labourer—but of all the servants, of all the people, of God. And you must not let any partisanship, social or political or ecclesiastical either, disqualify you from what is your praise and glory.

And, thirdly and lastly; if from position, or by education, or by any other practically irresistible impulse, you are forced into the arena of controversy, do not begin or join in strife without assaying your armour. Know what you are doing—equip yourselves with study of laws and men. And remembering that in human affairs no two parties ever are in opposition on questions on which much cannot be said on both sides; remembering that in human affairs no rule is without its exceptions; remembering that in human affairs no one principle ever works in isola-

tion or in vacuo, and that, therefore, the man who risks all on, or rules all on, one principle, in disregard or contempt for the working of other principles, is sure to fail and so mislead others to their fall;—remembering those three points and whose servant you are, and whose spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, ghostly strength, knowledge, and true godliness, you have prayed for, let all your dealings be the dealings of men, the beginning and ending and fulfilling of whose work is in the fear of God and the love of those whom Christ died for.

Things Spiritual and Natural.

In conclusion, let me put before you very shortly one further consideration: our whole work, of clergy and laity, is to prepare a people for the Lord—a people united in heart and faith and good purpose, working together and for one another; a body not divided, but conscious of unity in growth and sympathy. And in this work things spiritual and things natural lie very close together. The clergy have to do with both; the laity have to do with both; the things natural are the things spiritual spiritually considered. Let the clergy employ themselves in seeking the temporal as well as the spiritual improvement of their people; let them not be ashamed to learn the matters of business which constitute the material interests of their neighbours. I do not say, let the clergy be farmers or sanitary inspectors, or doctors or lawyers, but let them learn so far the language and attitude of those who have such interests, that when and where the opportunity comes they may do their quota of service, and try to draw class and class together in sympathy and mutual helpfulness. Despite of what education is doing to put classes on an equality, it has not yet done enough to show them that old truth, that what touches one class touches all. If the capitalist is ever to understand the workman, if the farmer is ever to understand the labourer, it is by the cultivation of that sympathy and helpfulness which it is the special province of the clergyman to teach and exemplify, basing it upon the true principle of Christian unity of purpose,

interest, and destiny. The Church is the salt of the earth; if the salt lose its savour, wherewith shall the earth be salted?—the salt itself is worthless for the land or for the dunghill. Do not take these words amiss. Clergy and churchwardens, too, have a great work in drawing hearts together, classes to classes, ranks to ranks; but it must be done, as every other religious or active duty has to be done, by action upon individuals and through individuals on one another, in church and out of church, in school and out of school, in work and in play, in sickness and in health, whenever and wherever the leaven of sympathy can be made to work.

SECOND VISITATION CHARGE

APRIL AND MAY, 1893.

Higher Criticism.

OF important topics you will not be surprised to hear that I regard as the most important the discussions on the higher criticism of the Old Testament Scripture, and the resulting, but even more directly absorbing question, how far the results of that criticism may be allowed to affect the doctrine of the Incarnation, especially in relation to the fulness and perfection of our Lord's knowledge. Three years ago, in my first charge, I ventured to advise that, in the contemplation of these questions, we should do well to maintain an attitude of calmness, patience, and tolerance for a developing view; whilst holding firmly—and it is only by those who do hold firmly that such calmness, patience, and tolerance can be maintained—whilst holding firmly the divine authority of scripture, and the perfect knowledge, as well as the perfect power, of the Son of God Incarnate. I certainly was inclined at the time to be hopeful, that God, who knows the hearts of those who raise these questions, and sees the faith and sincerity of their treatment, would guide, as time went on, their investigations and speculations to the confirmation of the faith of others, to edification rather than to the increase of doubts, difficulties, and negations, amongst earnest inquirers after truth.

Now, however, whilst I would still urge the calmness, patience, and tolerance as before, I confess that I do not see that the dangers which I apprehend have become less dangerous than they were, or the crisis of belief less critical.

Time has been given for the explanation of difficulties, and they have not been explained : opportunity for the reconciliation of inconsistencies, and they have not been reconciled : occasion, ample occasion, for the reconstruction of affirmative arguments which seemed to be impaired by the negative character of the criticism, and they are, to say the least, very slow, indeed, in the process of reconstruction. Meanwhile, the leaven of misgiving has spread : the sermons preached in churches, where better things might be expected, have, in the mouths of some of the younger clergy, I fear, taken an apologetic and attenuating tone with regard to the great features of the faith : and the popular foible, that nothing should be believed against which any objection could or can be raised—a weakness of public sense, which gives to the argument of negation a preponderant importance before discussion is fairly begun—has spread accordingly. Manuals of theology are drawn up and circulated, in which these difficulties have a place, and find far too irresolute and indeterminate handling ; matters are treated as conclusively proved that are only negatively mooted, and the true suspensive attitude of real criticism is superseded by the assumption that everything requires to be re-stated and re-proved.

I have no wish to say anything severe of the scholars whose work has conduced to these painful stages of theological thought ; for real results, I fain would hope, they are not. I believe that in many cases, certainly in all the cases of men with whom I am personally acquainted, it is the very strength of the conviction that the verities of the faith must come out unimpaired from the ordeal with which they are being tested, that makes them bold in the handling of matters which men of less vivid convictions would handle more cautiously. I admire the strength of their convictions, but I grieve over the short-sightedness, and I had almost said the self-will or absolute selfishness, of their procedure. A man may sometimes, by reason of his own strong conviction and faith in his own cause, overstate the case of the adversary to a degree that is very dangerous to those who, with all candour, are not blessed

with the same strength of conviction or the same knowledge. A man's humility will occasionally blind him to the fact that he may unintentionally be misleading those to whom his sincerity and humility constitute a strong attraction. Rash confidence and too generous display of candour will never justify us in understating the merits of the cause which we have to defend, or in contenting ourselves with incompletely realising the issues of our points and methods of controversy: whether it be the question of Inspiration, or the Roman Catholic question, or of Education, or any other that touches the life of man. In such matters the theologian must be more than the mere lawyer or the mere logician. Souls are at stake; and no one can deceive himself with the belief that the want of sympathy and care for others can be excused by the finesse of the advocate or the assumed impartiality of the impetuous critic, or even by the ingenuous setting forth of the difficulty which the writer has of making clear to himself his own convictions.

But I will say something now of the questions, rather than of the school of students that are raising them. Most of us can remember the cry that was raised thirty years ago about the Bible being treated like any other book, and of the good men who tried to believe that if it were so treated the result would be that its divine character and authority would come out all the clearer from the treatment. I have no doubt that if it were so treated, that would be the result; and perhaps, by-and-by, when the bonds of old faith and the new elasticity of emancipated thought have changed their present form and character as forces of action and reaction, it may come to pass. But I do not expect to live to see it; and to men who have lived and worked and looked on so long as I have, it seems impossible that the Bible could ever be treated so. The Bible is not like any other book; no other book comes to us with a claim authorised by the Church of our Baptism as containing the Word of God; or containing so constant assertion of its claim to be heard as the Word of God; or as cited, one part of it by another part, by a sort of

mutual testimony, as of divine authority, or as consistently upheld by the long consent of the Christian ages as the Law and the Testimony. So it comes to us, and it is not reduced to the level of other books even by the complete repudiation of every point of this claim at the hands of those who would treat it otherwise. This means that it is to us a paramount witness of truth : if it fail, that is, if the Lord Jesus is not, in it and through it all, the key and binding-string and central truth that holds it all together, then the result of its promulgation is the most ghastly of all delusions and disappointments by which all the best instincts of human nature have ever been repelled and belied ; it is a phantasm, by which He who would deceive us or let us deceive ourselves to our own destruction would be no fit object of worship, even if such a person exist at all : a book which comes to us thus cannot be like any other.

But, secondly, our own relation to it is such that we cannot look upon it so. We have been brought up in profound respect for it and love of it. We have been taught to base all our faith in the unseen world upon it ; our convictions or anticipations of eternity ; our belief in immortality ; our ideas of the government of the world, of the existence of God, of the law of life, right, and virtue ; of our own subjection to and inability to keep that law ; of the love that provided a way to forgiveness and restoration ; of the work of the atonement, of the Incarnation and the sacrifice ; of the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment ; of the destiny of our own souls and of theirs, without whom happiness in its true perfection is altogether inconceivable ; in a word, our knowledge, if we call it knowledge, our apprehension, if we dare not call it knowledge, of all that is desirable, hopeful, and other than miserable in this life and that which is to follow it. The whole form and character of our religious thought is framed on it ; all has come to us through the teaching of this book, or through the teaching of the Church which bases its authority and teaching upon it. It is impossible for those who have been so taught to put themselves into a neutral

or impartial attitude regarding it, without such a strain, such a wrench of mental and moral force, as drives them past the central station of fair judgment. The effort that carries us so far carries us further. Indifference to Holy Scripture means disregard for it: we cannot treat it as any other book even if it were susceptible of such treatment; but it is like none other, and, indeed, it is the fact that it is like no other that has led critics to apply to it methods of arbitrary, wanton, and conjectural criticism, which, applied to Greek or Roman, or even Anglo-Saxon literature, would be laughed out of court.

But do not think that there is not something to be said on the other side. First, the Bible, although speaking with authority, speaks with an authority that contemplates proof and deliberate acceptance; and, secondly, we, unless our acceptance is to be servile and abjectly unintelligent, are bound to do our utmost to realise both what we believe and why we believe it. That is to say, the Book itself recognises, and we by our very constitution of thought and affection are bound to the exercise of what it recognises, the necessity of judgment, the proving and holding fast.

Now if these two considerations formed a dilemma, the only possible attitude of fair thought would be one that, long before now, would have set the Bible, and all religious ideas drawn from it, outside the region of practical questioning: either it must be accepted with the mechanical receptiveness of an empty vessel, or it must be treated as on a level with a leading article: it must long ago have lost the hold on the heart which, humanly speaking, is the result of nineteen centuries of faith. There is no such dilemma: so much is clear to our apprehension of what is going on in the world now, in commentary, in controversy, in exposition, in inspiration. The practical lesson is the inculcation of a habit of moral or spiritual, and mental or intellectual effort. Morally and spiritually we must try to approach the study with a living and loving sense of what we owe to our Bible; grateful acceptance and prayer for guidance; trustful receptiveness: whatever mental trials

await us in it, we hold our Bible as the gift of our Lord's love, with a desire to prove true that which we humbly believe that the guidance of the Holy Spirit disposes us to believe as true. The effort must be trustful ; it must also be patient ; longing to see clearer but conscious of its own imperfection, ready to work sincerely, candidly, industriously, and also waiting humbly on what may be the divine reticence in revelation ; recognising contradictions that we cannot reconcile, looking down promising vistas of loving anticipation that seem for the present to close in obscurity ; analysing records of events and prophecies of events, that need to be brought into correlation with each other and with the general purpose of Revelation, and with the course of the history of the Church and of the world. The patient attitude will not be shaken, either by the impetuosity of spiritual devotion or by intolerance of intellectual suspense. And a third point is humility ; the sense of our own fallibility in faith and apprehension of truth, our human and personal ignorance.

Everyone, I imagine, would grant this much on the moral and spiritual side. But how about the mental or intellectual attitude of the believing critic ? Here comes the great difficulty. Given a book which, as I have said, on its own claims and on the grounds of our personal relation to it, is unlike any other book, how can we criticise it ? Does criticism really require a position of such indifference as amounts to unfriendliness ? Must all criticism begin with negation ? How about the parallels and analogies of other literatures and histories on which the laws of criticism must, if they are to have comparative value, be framed ; how about the nature of the proof which is to be demanded, and with or without which the mind of the student, studying trustfully and lovingly, is or is not to be contented ? How about theories of inspiration, and the questions of scientific, literary, and historic investigation ? And what of the relation between spiritual devotional study, and the results of these sorts of questionings ? We cannot say that these are simple considerations, or that it is easy to formulate answers that will answer all the questions that are

suggested by them. There is a criticism which analyses and distinguishes in the hope of making that which is obscure in belief clear and coherent. There is another which, beginning from an untrustful starting-point, calls everything into question, assumes the validity of every negative suggestion, almost the equal cogency of every new conjecture. There is a criticism which is a very wantonness of experimental curiosity. There is a need of distinction and caution in calling these by the same name.

But now, first, we have to remember that, as different subject-matters are only susceptible of or amenable to different methods of proof, we must not look for equal cogency in all conclusions from the tests of evidence applied to the Bible, either in its several parts, or as compared with other books. It is only in mathematical matters that perfect demonstration can be secured, and the Bible is not a mathematical book. Next in degree to mathematical demonstration comes the sort of proof that natural science or physical science uses. Some of the weapons alleged against the theories of inspiration of the Bible are drawn from the scientific armoury; such, for instance, are those connected with the theory of creation and the doctrine of evolution. With regard to these, which lie rather across the line that I am taking, I must so far digress as to say that scientific terms are used in the Bible only for the purpose of helping a revelation of the power and energy and will of Almighty God; a revelation which, to be a revelation at all, must be made in language intelligible to those to whom it was made, and which must accordingly be open to the limitations of human speech and language. As it is a growing revelation, its language is liable to variety of interpretation, as the knowledge of the laws of nature increases, and that interpretation is susceptible of readjustment. The original word, cleared of the incrustation of successive interpretations, is simple, and, its purpose being admitted, lies outside of scientific criticism. Evolution, if it be true, is but what one may call the grammar of the book of nature: an explanation of a part of the law

of the working of powers for whose origination it cannot, does not really attempt to give account. And yet before the demand be made that the history of creation as told in Holy Scripture should be surrendered as less than perfectly and essentially true, science should be called on to produce a theory more reasonable, more in accord and consistent with its own manifold demands, than the theory of a personal creator and a definite period of creation supplies. This, I think it is no treason to truth to affirm, no system of science has yet done. Whether or no the first chapter of Genesis can be or ever will be reconciled with the discoveries of physical science, it is surely clear that no system of physical science has yet provided or can be expected to provide a theory of causation, or motive power, which is more reasonable: the whole cosmogony of evolution can offer only to trace and disentangle the links of a chain, the origination and maintenance of which depend on causes that are as much beyond it as they are beyond the reach of any other effort of human thought. The whole array of modern philosophy, negative or positive, hypothetical or inductive, has not got nearer solving the problem of existence than did the schoolmen. But that I must leave: a conjecture which is not disproved is not therefore to be regarded as proved, and a theory which is not proved is not therefore to be regarded as disproved.

As to the historical and literary criticism: one may ask, how can the principles of an art which depends on comparisons be applied to a material which is without a parallel, and where will you find a parallel to this material? Seek it in what are called the sacred books of the East: what do you find there? Except that they are sacred books, nothing comparable with it or parallel to it in spirit or authority. If any of them claim to be older than the Bible, the claim, if proved, would simply amount to a proof that the antiquity claimed for Hebrew literature is no unwarrantable assumption. I am sure that the true result of archæological inquiry as to the history of the most ancient nations, is the proof that, so far as literary possibilities are concerned, there is nothing at all that would

make incredible the antiquity which the earlier scriptures seem to claim and with which, humanly speaking, the evidence of their authenticity is so largely bound up. And are not the older scriptures, nay all of them, and the psalms especially, in all moral and spiritual bearings, as much out of commensurable relation with the latest as with the earliest date assigned to them? If the literary remains of Egypt and Assyria are to any extent older than the Pentateuch, they simply show that there is no impossibility in assigning the authorship to Moses. Older or more modern, they have no element of divine relation. Here and there there may be suggestions of a primitive light, there is, so far at least as they are interpreted, very little of the conviction of sin or righteousness or judgment, nothing of love, redemption, and life eternal. Neither does the rationale of language, considering the necessity of intelligible transmission, which involves an adaptation to the intelligence of the transmitters, supply any decisive element for criticism. We have no right to maintain the continuous miracle of invariable textual exactness for a period of two thousand years, many centuries of which were centuries of confusion and dispersion, during which ancient forms of language may have suffered translation and revision. But I am not aware that much stress is really laid on the minutiae of linguistic variations, which are themselves beyond the range of comparative criticism, or that much categorical dogmatism is based on facts, if there be any such extant, of the history of textual development.

Results of Criticism.

It is in the testing and tracing of historical developments that the greatest efforts of the higher criticism are made, and the results reached, which by some are regarded as most certain, and which to others appear at once most hazardous and destructive. Far be it from me to speak of these with the rashness of dogmatism. Historic criticism is a very patient study, with a very cautious method, very suspensive conclusions. History is itself research ; and a

research constantly expecting and receiving revision. It must be so, by the very limitation of human knowledge, in the region of matters with which it is most conversant; the very variety of human records differing with the angle of vision, the means, the capacity, and the purpose of the recorder. How much more so when and where the record is one without parallel! The criticism of the Bible from this point of view, the point of historic analogies, is full of risks; full of temptation; conjecture is very alluring, when and where the conjecturer is sure that his guess can only be met by another guess, or by the enunciation that guessing is unphilosophical, the acceptance of old theory being unphilosophical too: the very idea of a guess involves a tacit suspicion of the authority as it stands.

There is a destructive criticism, lawful within certain limits; wherever it has been applied to Holy Scripture itself, it has failed. There is a constructive criticism also within certain limits applicable and lawful; this has been used with Holy Scripture, and the result has been a sort of confirmation of some of the evidences, the loss of which would have been important. There is a wanton criticism—tentative by destructive action, tentative in constructive operation—against which we have to guard all the more carefully because it is liable to be so used, in irresponsible levity of hypothesis, as to shake the faith of those who listen curiously to it; a trifling with the word of God. It is a grievous thing when, treating conjectures as proved conclusions, men challenge the whole of the accepted evidence of the creeds on the truth of such considerations—most grievous of all, beyond limit of patience or silence in protest, when conjectural criticism is admitted as evidence against the word of Him who is the Truth.

For here the crisis becomes most urgent, the issues most imminent and most fatally important. I cannot imagine greater issues than those which these considerations are likely to force upon us. If the result of the present speculations should be the displacement or rejection of any considerable part of the Jewish law and record, it would involve the re-writing of the whole of Catholic, of

Christian theology ; and, what is more critical still, such an explanation of the way in which the Old Testament Scriptures are used in the New as would call in question the knowledge and honesty of the writers whom we believe to be inspired, and in some matters endanger the authority of the words reported to be spoken by our Lord.

For we have no doubt that we have at the present day the Old Testament Scriptures in much the same form as that in which they were before our Saviour in His earthly life ; and we have no doubt as to the meaning of the appeal to the Law and the Prophets which He himself used, and which, in argument after argument, is pursued in the writings of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. This needs no proof, argument, or comment from me : the Law and the Prophets are cited not as an *argumentum ad hominem*, but as a body of evidence of continuous, of eternal counsel.

Is it enough to say we are content to accept the Old Testament, implicitly as our Saviour accepts and uses it ; that which it is to Him it shall be to us ; in ignorance, in doubt, in perplexity, in variety of applicability, in confusion of meaning, in incoherence of argument, in inappropriateness of quotation ; in uncritical and uninquiring acquiescence, we are willing to hold it on His warrant ? There is something to be said for such a loyal, trustful acceptance, but it is scarcely a fulfilment of the recommendation to search the Scripture for evidence, or for reproof, or doctrine, or correction, or instruction in righteousness. Still as to special phases of questioning it must be practically sufficient for many minds ; and beyond there is no room for appeal :—

“What His word doth make it
That I believe and take it.”

But practically the matter cannot rest here. If our Saviour Himself is supposed to be charged with using as evidence matter that is not evidence, either by intentional perversion or hazardous interpretation, and such charge is proved, then His authority falls to the ground, and we

are of all men the most miserable. No Christian can tolerate such a supposition, and none do attempt it. Losing hold on Him as the Truth, we lose our hold on Him and truth together. But here comes in the speculation about the limitation of our Lord's knowledge, and the interpretation of the word in the Epistle to the Philippians, which, in the Authorised Version is read, "made Himself of no reputation," and in the Revised Version, "emptied Himself." On St. Paul's use of this word, as I need not tell you, a formulated idea has been raised that threatens to affect the most essential doctrines connected with the Incarnation; and our Lord is supposed accordingly to have, in becoming man, divested Himself of certain powers which He had with the Father, of almightiness and all-knowledge, so far as the exercise of them through His human nature could, or could not, be supposed to be possible.

κένωσις

That such can be the direct and proper meaning of the word "emptied Himself" in the passage cited, I cannot, notwithstanding the array of authority with which I may be pressed, at all admit. There must be a parallel between the example of our Lord's action and our duty which it is cited to illustrate. There is in fact no parallel whatever between such a *κένωσις* as that which I have described and that by which it is in our power to imitate the Lord Jesus, as we are exhorted to do upon this principle. It is self-surrender, self-effacement, and humiliation for the sake of others, that we are to attempt to practise—not the limitation of our power of helping them, but the devotion of our whole self for them, as He devoted Himself for us.

It is, to my mind, very incidentally and not at all appropriately that this expression is pressed into the service of the doctrine of limitation. It does, however, illustrate it so far as to give an instance of something which the Son of God becoming man, for us men and for our salvation, did give up; who when He was rich for our sake became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich. And so far it

does illustrate the theory of limitation, but only so far. Nor ought it ever to be used as the keyword of a theory with which it has so little to do: or as the decisive proof of a doctrine which if it were intended to be taught could not safely be left to an isolated text.

That our blessed Lord in the Incarnation did, by His own determinate counsel, one with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit through whom He offered Himself without blemish, place Himself under conditions by which habitually he regulated the exercise of His divine power in and through His humanity, I think is a matter of unquestioned Catholic doctrine—an habitual self-restraint put upon the exercise of those powers of fulness of the Godhead which dwell in Him bodily; a restraint upon the display of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are all in Him, hidden whilst He was with us, but never suspended or laid aside, never dissembled or repudiated, a *πλήρωμα* with which *κένωσις* has no common term or element. Whenever and wherever it is said of our Lord that He could not do this or that, or that this or that which He had with the Father was not His own to give, the expression can certainly be interpreted as meaning that such exercise of will or power was incompatible with the conditions under which He had placed Himself; and the same interpretation applies to all expressions in the Gospel which imply any change, or development of purpose, or exercise of desire in prayer on the part of Him who is, in His divine nature, unchangeable and beyond all limitation of foreknowledge of will; even to the last words of identification with us, *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?*

But the limitation of knowledge is a very different thing from the limitation of the exercise of power. Power itself has its essence *in posse*, its manifestation in exercise of will; knowledge has its essence *in esse*. We cannot, in our thought, define or intelligently explain away the knowledge of the Lord Incarnate. We cannot conceive that He could have knowledge and not use it, as He could have power and not exercise it; His omniscience is of the essence of the personality in which manhood and Godhead united in Him.

With this belief I feel that I am bound to accept the language of our Lord in reference to the Old Testament Scriptures as beyond appeal. Where He says that Moses and the Prophets wrote or spoke to Him, and the report of His saying this depends on the authority of His Evangelist, I accept His warrant for understanding that Moses and the Prophets did write and speak about Him, in the sense in which I believe that He means it. Where He speaks of David in spirit calling Him Lord, I believe that David in spirit did call him Lord, and I am not affected by doubts thrown on the authorship of the 110th Psalm, except so far as to use His authority to set those doubts aside.

The matter is more difficult when we look at the one passage in which the Son is understood to declare His own ignorance of a matter which the Father hath kept in His own power. For the inquiry as to the meaning of the words would lead us into very high and transcendental regions, and yet the Church has lived for nineteen centuries and believed patiently without having them explained. The question turns on an idea quite different from that in the other case. It was quite within the limits of possibility for Jesus, or indeed for any mere man, to know whether Moses wrote Deuteronomy or David wrote any of the psalms; without any exercise of divine knowledge or power He might know this by tradition, by historical evidence, by critical or diplomatic skill. But the knowledge of the coming of the day of the Lord, "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father," is a matter quite beyond us. The words are surpassingly strong; the powers are in an ascending scale—no one—not even the angels, not the Son; as if even the Son in His divinity, above the angels, not lower as in His humanity, had yet something to be shown Him by the Father, to whom He, begotten before all worlds and being of one substance with Him, still appeals as the one source of all being, as well as of all authority, power, and knowledge. We do not venture to put such an interpretation on the words, we would rather stand in awe and sin not; we would veil our faces in our absolute ignorance of

the method and character of divine knowledge. For we cannot even see how the Father's perfect knowledge of a point, the fixedness of which would seem to limit His divine freedom of action, His liberty to alter it, can be reconciled with His perfect power: we cannot see how we are to evaluate the common measure by which the divine way of knowing, the divine power of determining, can be compared with any way of knowing or determining that is within our reach. We cannot see how our knowledge, conditioned and made intelligible, possible, only under terms of time and space, can be made to translate a sort of knowledge in which no such terms can be supposed to limit infinity. The words as understood by those to whom they were spoken were a simple denial that it was within the conditions of the work of Incarnation that the day and hour should be revealed. To us they mean thus much more, even the Son could not translate the Father's determination into words or language of our knowledge. And He does not say, "I know not"; but, as it is no function of the Fatherhood to judge, when He has committed all judgment unto the Son, so it is no function of the Sonship to know that which the Father hath kept in His own power; as "to sit on My right hand or on My left is not Mine to give." Although "what things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise; for the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth."

The doctrine, then, of the perfect possession but habitual restraint of His divine powers by the Son of Man during the thirty years of His life on earth, does not allow of any imputation of ignorance or incapacity. If such imputation be once admitted, notwithstanding all argumentative safeguards and compensating considerations, the great Gospel of Grace and Salvation is touched on its keystone, and on whomsoever it falls it shall grind him to powder. Grant it—then, could Jesus of Nazareth forget, could He mistake, could He become confused in argument, could He be inconsistent in His teaching, could He be Himself mistaken? Grant it, and what safeguard have we that He did not

forget, was not mistaken or confused or inconsistent or Himself deceived? We may ask no end of such questions. If the Saviour were ignorant once, how, when, or where does the limitation of His knowledge cease, and within what terms, beyond that of the self-conditioning of constant self-restraint, does it affect the region of His mediatorial work? Could our loving God—for if all else is a mistake, there must be a true and a living God—could He treat us so?

I will make no apology for saying this to you. I cannot rationalise the doctrine of the Atonement, or weigh or analyse the blood of the covenant. I cannot draw the articles of the everlasting covenant of the Incarnation. It is only in a very distant way that I can fashion to myself my idea of what my Lord has done, is doing, and will do, as I trust, for me. I cannot read the doctrine of Incarnation as I could a book of Euclid, or the Bible as a poem of Ovid or Milton. But I think that I know whom I have believed. I would that all men could think of Him as I do; but I cannot bear to anticipate a day when the Church shall cry out to Jesus of Nazareth, Thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived; or to the unknown and unknowable, Why didst Thou let Him deceive Himself and us? Does it strike you that my words are too strong? I have indeed run on a long way from my starting-point, but He who will help our unbelief and increase our faith, will surely give us grace also to observe a loving, trustful, courageous patience until all such things are made plain, and He has guided His own into all truth.

Lincoln Judgment.

The time has come, I think, now, when I may be expected to say a few words about what we know as the Lincoln trial and judgment. The immediate interest and excitement about it is over, and men are beginning, for the most part, to take a judicial and just estimate of its importance and ultimate effects. I need not refer to my own connexion with it, further than to say that it was only after a very determined resistance to pressure from the Archbishop

that I agreed to act as an assessor in the Lambeth Court ; the proposal came to me at a moment when I was engaged in the removal from my northern see, and when my hands were quite full of new work. The engagements for the trial threw my Confirmation tour into grievous disorder, and seriously interrupted my first attempts to gain the confidence of the clergy. They occasioned, moreover, such a pressure of work and hurry as threatened for the first months of my episcopate nothing less than a thorough breakdown. For the help and hospitality that I had at that trying time from all, clergy and laity, whom I had to deal with, I can never be sufficiently grateful. Before the pressure was quite over I was relieved from very much of the anxiety of this part of the matter by the consecration of the Bishop of Reading as suffragan, a boon for which I may honestly say that I can feel grateful even to the exigent urgencies of the Lincoln trial.

The Lambeth trial was itself a severe demand on the time, patience, and self-command of all concerned with it. The details of it are still sufficiently familiar to all who took an intelligent interest in it. Of the bitterness of feeling which it engendered and developed I should be glad to be able to say that it is a thing of the past ; I most earnestly trust that the method and policy that instituted the proceedings against such a man as the Bishop of Lincoln, on such grounds, and by such methods, are indeed relegated to the region of discarded weapons and discredited expedients. I believe that the cautions expressed in the last paragraph of the Archbishop's decision are still necessary, but that good men on both sides have seriously taken them to heart : "The Church has a right to ask that her congregations may not be divided either by needless pursuance or by exaggerated suspicions of practices not in themselves illegal."

As to the material details. It will be remembered that, from February 12th to July 24th, 1889, the Court was employed in hearing arguments and framing a judgment on the character of its own authority, legally and historically questioned. Whether a Bishop could be tried for

an offence against the Act of Uniformity, whether a Bishop could be tried for an offence, created by modern law, by a tribunal constituted by ancient law, the modern law not having in any way provided for the treatment of the new offences by any specific or definite reference to the operation of the ancient law, whether the tribunal as constituted was, in historical truth of detail, exactly such a court as ancient church law would have recognised as primitive and authoritative; these questions, or points necessarily arising upon them, were discussed with great learning and acuteness by most able and experienced advocates. The Archbishop, with whom, constitutionally, on this occasion (by himself and without the necessary co-operation of assessors) the decision on this point of jurisdiction devolved, gave most serious attention to the arguments, and pronounced a judgment which, although it could hardly have been, in the circumstances, other than it was, was a model of lucidity and exhaustiveness. Neither its lucidity, however, nor its exhaustiveness saved it from severe criticism. There was an immediate rush to the *Corpus Juris Canonici* and the text-books. From these stores of illustration theories were erected, and from the same stores were drawn the implements of demolition. A man's orthodoxy, especially a Bishop's, was determined according as he happened to agree or to disagree with the conclusions, which a first investigation of the sources (I had almost written the *sortes*) of the Canon Law impressed on the fresh student. Even now the question, how a peccant Bishop can be canonically tried, is a matter over which many battles may be fought. Most happily our own Church history has furnished, at any period, an infinitesimal stock of precedents. That this state of things may continue is a matter of most earnest hope, and a fit object for prayer also: that our Great Head, our Saviour, the Prince of Peace, will so guide the minds and hearts of those, who, by His grace, are called to the perilous work of the pastorate, that they may not in word or deed, in self-discipline, or in the discipline of others, be brought into the position of offenders against the law which,

whether it be spiritual or temporal law, sustains their moral power and justifies whilst it enforces their practical jurisdiction. I may just add that the adaptation of proceedings on the basis of ancient law to offences against modern Church law is as yet not so easy a matter as it seems to despatch off-hand. If, before the Reformation, Bishops were the sole judges (within certain very general laws) of the details of ritual, the offence as against the Act of Uniformity was not within the distinct contemplation of the law then in force, which law was the only law on which the Lambeth Court could base its authority. The practical point was whether such an ancient court could take cognisance of a new offence not distinctly referred to it by new legislation. The decision practically came to the determination that it could.

The arguments on the merits of the case were carried on during the remainder of 1889, and the Archbishop's judgment, framed with the advice of his assessors, was given on November 21st, 1890. Against the decision an appeal was laid before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that tribunal on August 2nd, 1892, gave its reasons for advising the Queen on the whole case as treated by the Archbishop; for the most part confirming the judgment of the Lambeth Court.

A word or two on the several points will be more than sufficient. I have no doubt that all of you have made up your minds one way or another about them. I will take them in order, mainly, however, with a view to point out the way in which, as I think, they have lessons in them for future guidance, and so far as they are illustrative of movements and notions which we may be called on, as years advance, to deal with equitably, reasonably, and considerately. I think also that you have a right to know what, irrespective of the particular circumstances of the Lincoln case, the attitude of your Bishop has been with regard to them.

Mixed Chalice.

The first article was that on the Mixed Chalice; the mixing of water with wine in the Holy Eucharist, and the

consecration and administration of the mixed cup. Upon this the Archbishop's decision, accepted by the Judicial Committee, came to this, that the use of the mixed chalice is not unlawful, but that the mixing of it must not be made a ceremonial part of the divine service. It would not have been difficult, I think, to have gone further, and urged that the use of the mixed cup has even a higher sanction than that of the unmixed, in the use of primitive antiquity and almost universal usage. Nor, I imagine, would it have been irregular to urge that the rubrical words, "it shall suffice," applied to the element of bread, at a time when not only the bread usual to be eaten, but the wafer bread also, was still in use in our churches, might with a just analogy be applied to the other element; in other words, that "it shall suffice" implied the minimum rather than the maximum of requirements. These points, however, were not circumstantially raised, and the judge was not called upon so much to expound the whole question as to determine for or against the cogency of the charge in the case. I commend, then, this point carefully to your conscientious acceptance. Let those clergy who regard the observance of the ancient custom as of great importance, observe it under the conditions which the Archbishop's exposition contains. Let those who do not regard it as important abstain from exaggerations as to the meaning of the custom and suspicion against those who differ from them. To the great majority of sound Churchmen to whom the point is entirely subordinate to the infinitely greater matter of the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and the strengthening and refreshing of their souls by His body and blood, quarrels and bitterness, disputation of upon this, as upon several of the other points of the judgment, are simply matters of wondering and sorrowing apprehension.

Ablutions.

The next point is that of the Ablutions. On this the decisions move without any hesitation. We are to consume reverently what is left of the consecrated elements, and the

cleansing of the vessels appears to be a not improper completion of the act ; which act is immediately to follow the blessing. It would seem that it should suffice for this to be done before leaving the Holy Table, or at the credence, or even in the vestry. The judgment suggests the credence: I would advise that nothing, except the final putting away of the cleansed vessels, should be left to the vestry ; certainly the consumption of the remainder of the elements should not. But without laying down any rule for the method of consuming the last drops in the cup or the last crumbs on the paten, I would urge that it should be done as quickly as the word "reverently" admits. The service is already long enough, and a great many devout people, having completed their act of communion, are tempted to impatience at the tedious semi-ceremonial that in some of our churches follows before the priest quits the sanctuary. It is better that the congregation should wait until he has quitted it, and should not be puzzled, or made suspicious or weary, by the length of an operation in which they themselves have no part. This caution, which may, I fear, be unwelcome to some of my younger friends, seems to me to be by no means unnecessary in reference to other adjuncts and auxiliaries of divine service. There is a mediæval sentiment which often occurs to me in respect to this: *Spiritus sanctus nescit tarda molimina*; I recognise no special sanctity in that which inspires irresistible tedium.

Eastward Position.

The fourth and fifth of the articles concerned what is known familiarly, too familiarly, as the Eastward Position; the position of the priest at the Lord's Table before and during the prayer of consecration, and the securing, where this position is adopted, that the manual acts of the consecration be done before the people. It was determined that practically there is a liberty for the clergyman to take the questioned position, as well as liberty to take a position at the north end of the table and look southwards; and that, provided the manual act of breaking bread before the

people and taking the cup into his hands be performed according to the rubric, the position before the table is lawful during the consecration.

I do not know that the treatment of these articles requires comment, but I will say a word or two now in reference to my own conduct in the matter, which has been sometimes impugned with severe comment, owing to a circumstance which took place when I was Bishop of Chester. I apologise, if you think that this is a matter of mere personal interest. I have, ever since my ordination in 1848, used the eastward position in the Ante-Communion, and since I was ordained priest in 1850, at the consecration prayer. I believe that I adopted it, as many young clergymen did at the time, not so much because we thought that there was very much precedent in the existing state of ritual as because we thought that the best attitude of prayer to God was not the attitude of the face turned to the people, and we were vexed with the sight of the clergyman lolling with his arms on a great table-cushion and hitching the sacred vessels about at the full length of his arms, long or short, during the most solemn parts of the service. It also seemed to us, as the judgment has justified us in holding, that it was not out of accord with the rubric. It was certainly not until long after the dates I have mentioned that I heard of any complaint about it as tending to illustrate a suspected tendency towards a really dangerous doctrine. Of course, everything that was apparently new was called Roman then, but there was nothing more Roman in this than in preaching in a surplice or saying the prayer for the Church Militant. One or two people objected to the clergyman, as they said, turning his back to the people; but one or two people object to anything; and serious objection was raised only later, when views, more pronounced perhaps than were acceptable, began to assert themselves, and when, I may say confidently, more just and reverent practice at the Holy Sacrament began extensively to be observed. It was not, however, until 1884, that the matter had for me any more special interest than was involved in my own personal consistency. When I

went to Chester I knew that I had, in my very dear and old friend, Dean Howson, a neighbour who took the contrary view, and had committed himself very strongly to it. As soon as I had accepted the see, long before I was consecrated, I began to correspond with him about it. I claimed my liberty, but I did not assert any authority or lay down a rule for anyone else. He very naturally disliked the introduction of what he thought a new and wrong custom into his and my Cathedral Church. It so happened that, owing to circumstances quite unconnected with this matter, I did not celebrate in the Cathedral until I had been Bishop for several months; and, when I did celebrate, I did so as I had done for thirty-four years and as I meant to do, and still mean to do, because I believe it to be the right way. The Dean made a protest and circulated it. We never for one moment had anything like a personal grievance in reference to it. I did what I thought my duty, and he knew it; he did what he thought was his, and I knew it. But although, as I have said, we had been exchanging letters about this for six months before, and the difference of opinion was very well known, and the Dean's protest was actually circulated before my act was done, the religious newspapers represented me as having sprung an unkind surprise upon my friend, and indeed rather as having gone beyond my right in doing what I had done in my own Cathedral. With those people who believe what they read in religious newspapers, I believe that I still labour under this stigma. I did not think that it was for me to contradict it; but to you perhaps I may now owe it that you should not be led to misapprehend my attitude or history on a matter to which the Lincoln trial has certainly given a more prominent interest than it had before. I apologise beforehand to those who think that I have said too much about myself.

Well, as to the matter itself, I rest it on first principles of worship and on a fair interpretation of the rubrics. I think that, when we are speaking to the people, we should turn to the people, and when we are speaking to God for the people, we should turn the way that the people turn.

I understand "before the table" to mean in front of it; the north side, as historically interpreted, has some distinct difficulties, the form having been introduced when the table was set lengthwise, and in its natural application standing or falling with that usage. I think that, as the rubric stands, the letter is satisfied by the adoption of a position north from the centre of the table. I am not sure that, until the Collect comes, the ritual idea would not be satisfied by any position on the north side of the sacrarium: but I do not wish to suggest anything. I protest, however, most strongly against having the principle that I think makes things clear, being traversed by a custom which I see occasionally adopted, of reading the offertory sentences, and other portions of service obviously intended to be addressed to the congregation, by a clergyman looking away from them.

The one point that arises on this, that is of any special complexity, is the apparent difficulty of reconciling the eastward position at consecration with the performance of the manual acts before the people. As to this I may confess that I should myself have been inclined to understand the rubrical words, "before the people," as satisfied by the acts being all done before the congregation, and with no affectation of secrecy or ritual mystery. The Court, however, and I as a member of it, did think it just to be on the safer side, and believed that it was more thoroughly in harmony with the general intention of the service as reformed, that it should interpret it as it did. So the manual acts of breaking the bread and of holding the cup should be done so that they who are willing to see them should see them. And I see no reason why this cannot be done easily—either by the minister setting the paten and the cup a little to his right, so that he may break the bread on the paten as it stands, and hold the cup as it stands: or, as I have myself been used to do, turning to the congregation and holding the paten in the left hand, whilst I break the bread with the right hand, then showing the cup in my hand to the people before I lay my hand upon it. I am quite prepared to be told that in doing this

I am acting against the law of ritual, or even against the Canon Law, but I am a little hardened against the judgment of those who, whilst accustoming themselves, and assuming to be, a Canon Law to themselves, solve all questions in their own way. There is no difficulty in doing what is to be done reverently and devoutly; but it is a very disagreeable thing to have to do anything reverently and devoutly, when at the time one is forced to observe that indecent curiosity rather than devotion is the prevailing feeling with some of those to whom one is called on to minister. It is a discomfort and a harass, but it must be borne until people have learned to behave better; and we shall not teach them to behave better by crotchitness and perversity in ceremonial detail. With you, surely, there can be no need for me to protest solemnly and most strongly against the reprisal measure of moving the Lord's Table and setting it lengthwise, which has been unhappily advocated and adopted in a few churches where the discerning of the Lord's Body must be understood to be an idea of very little import.

Agnus Dei.

The sixth article concerns the singing of the *Agnus Dei*, as it is called, after the consecration. I confess that I think that the objection to this is altogether unreasonable on the grounds stated in the judgment, and that the fact of the omission of the words in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., after the introduction of them in the first Prayer Book, is a very insufficient reason for the application of a principle of "omission is prohibition," a principle which seems to me to be based on the authority of the unprofitable servant in the parable of the talents. Surely there is no question, in any of the Christian communities, of the connexion between the Sacrament and the sacrifice of the death of Christ, however wide may be the divergencies of the communities as to the exact terms of the connexion. And to no one who receives the Sacrament can it be a really strange or foreign idea to welcome the participation with the words in question. The other day

I picked up a little book, *The Pious Parishioner*, printed in the reign of George II., a little manual for the Holy Communion, neither nonjuring nor Methodistical, as Methodism then was, and very highly Hanoverian, in which this very form is put into the mouth of the faithful receiver, to be said in his heart as soon as he has received. Whilst I am speaking of this, I will just for a moment digress to an illustrative circumstance of a trial at ecclesiastical law which took place in 1820 before Mr. Granville Vernon, the Chancellor and official principal of the Archbishop of York. It was about the lawfulness of singing metrical psalms and hymns in church. Mr. Vernon gave a long, a learned, and by no means sympathetic judgment. He went into the law and the history of the thing, and went against it. There was not authority for it, and with the lack of authority the practice could not be upheld: in fact, although he did not say so, omission was prohibition. But the judge was a wise man, and did not believe that the suit was instituted for the elucidation, assertion, or enforcement of the law, and accordingly, although his judgment was clear, he would issue no monition and give no costs. His words were, "I feel that the promoters of these articles were fairly entitled to a decision of the legal question to the best of my judgment; but if they proceed to call for sentence in this cause and decline the mediation which I before suggested, I shall consider them as wanting not only in a sense of their own interest, but in a regard to Christian charity and practical religion." I imagine that in the province of York there was little more heard of the illegality of metrical psalms; and I think that Mr. Vernon's practical decision set us a precedent that is beyond praise, in cases quite different from that in which he made it.

Lights.

We come next to the question of Lights—a question on which more anxiety was felt by a large number of people who liked the lights than on any of the other counts; and on which, as it turns out, the judgment of the courts

is less comprehensive and less cogent than it is on any other. You are aware that no formal decision was in question as to the use of lights; but, whilst the matter was discussed in the Archbishop's decision in such a way as to suggest the conclusion that lights were not in themselves unlawful, although the lighting of the candles during the service would be probably regarded as an unlawful ceremony, it was not determined that they were under any circumstances lawful during daylight. The ultimate decision merely exonerated the Bishop of Lincoln from any responsibility for what was, in this matter, done in his presence without any personal action on his part.

And so that matter rests, and will, I hope, be allowed to rest. The use of the lights is an ancient and, to my mind, an illustrative and edifying use. No one has ever thought of imposing it as a rule on people who do not like it. There are many churches in which at the early services it is almost a necessity, but such necessity ought not to be pleaded as an argument for a practice which is adopted mainly for other reasons. Personally I do not care about it, being constitutionally not particularly appreciative of such adjuncts of divine worship, and perhaps being rather likely to be disturbed than edified by a divergence from what I have been accustomed to. In fact, however, except when I am celebrating myself, I do not much notice lights. But this is not a time for ventilating one's likes or dislikes. The question of lights is not, as I said, decided in any definite or ultimate way. If omission is prohibition on the one side, on the other the omission of prohibition may be pleaded as a permission: I do not like to have people playing with such edged tools. Certainly there are many questions which it is much the safest neither to ask nor to answer.

Sign of the Cross.

The last articles concern the use of the Sign of the Cross in Absolution and Benediction. This the Archbishop decided was an innovation which must be discontinued. The grounds upon which he based the decision, which was

held good by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, involved some assertions of principle which seem to me of more importance than the decision itself, especially with reference to the idea of innovation and restoration of practices omitted, or supposed to be omitted, in our service books, from earlier or presumed earlier usage. In what I am going to say about some other points connected with this subject, I shall probably recur to these. As to the meaning of the sign of the Cross under the circumstances which led to the discussion, I confess that I am by no means so clear as I could wish to be, nor do I quite realise what the manual act was that was objected to. Both parties, however, seem to have understood it alike. I can only suspect that less well-informed ritualists may occasionally drift into such acts without being aware of it. It is very sad, indeed, that such a thing as the sign of the Cross should ever be brought into litigation; but the historical grounds of the difference of opinion are too obvious, and too deep also, to be regarded as unimportant. If the king of Judah was warranted in destroying the brazen serpent that Moses had made, surely we are not justified in making the sign of our redemption a stumbling-block in the way of those who associate it with ideas and practices which we, as well as they, are bound to repudiate. They may be very wrong, but that does not make it right for us to bring the Cross under blasphemy.

So, then, matters stand at present. I cannot attempt any augury for the future, although I am sure that your hopes and prayers are with mine for peace, and tolerant effort for the two contending parties to understand one another. It is most especially grievous that the matter about which the storm has for three centuries raged most tempestuously should have been the Holy Sacrament, which is, on the one side, the great exponent of the doctrine of the Atonement, and, on the other, the symbol and mystery of the unity of the body. Surely both sides might now rid themselves of the associations which the memories of a litigious past have so long burdened them with; associations which are very largely traceable, historically and

sentimentally, to practices, exactions, superstitions, impostures, exaggerations, and depravations, which they, against whom the memory of such things is made to tell, would most sincerely reprobate. God grant us some end to these divisions of heart. There are men on both sides, as we see from time to time, really earnest in seeking peace: there are still some bent upon aggravating differences. It has always been so, and must be so, I imagine, so long as men's views of proportion in things spiritual differ as they do now; neither study nor religious earnestness seems to abate the difficulty; and in the meanwhile many are driven into a sceptic attitude that will not attempt to solve questions which study and religious earnestness have led them to state on principles of diametrical contradiction.

Restoration of Old Customs.

It seems natural to follow up what I have been saying about ritual matters with some cautions and counsels, will strike you, perhaps, rather as personal, the result of personal likings or dislikings, rather than as official and *ex cathedrâ* pronouncements. I must fall back on what I have said in the opening of this charge.

First, then, as to the restoration of old customs which, having been either locally or generally lost sight of, it seems edifying to recur to wherever it can be done without giving offence. I put this first among my cautions because of what I have just been saying about the sign of the Cross. We have seen, within the last fifty years, many restorations to edification, the restored use of the surplice, the extended adoption of choral services, the turning to the east at the Creed, even the bowing at the most sacred name, the developed use of the offertory, the great extension of metrical hymnody;—many other things that to this generation are matters of course, we remember to have been matters of contention—continuity in some cases being difficult to prove, and disuse having become locally the rule. Now for the general restoration of such things there ought to be pleaded, not merely local con-

tinuities, but inherent reasonableness: such inherent reasonableness was, I think, to be pleaded for all the things that I have mentioned, as well as for the eastward position at the Lord's Table. But such inherent usefulness, and local continuity, cannot be pleaded for some of the practices which occasionally we come across in churches; and which I mention now, not so much because I find them in the churches of my own diocese, as because, owing to the rapid circulation of younger clergymen from diocese to diocese, there is a tendency to introduce new fashions generally. The matters which I mention first are small; they are such things as the multiplied genuflexions or even prostrations used in approaching the Lord's Table for communion; the lowering of the voice to a whisper in the pronouncing of the articles in the creeds that touch the Incarnation; the turning the back to the people whilst the offertory sentences are being said, and even, as I hear is occasionally done, whilst the Gospel is read; and this last is not a small thing. There are other points which I need not mention, as they may be very local indeed. Those which I have mentioned are such as I think can plead very little continuity, if any, and no inherent reasonableness. They are not English, or in accord with that attitude as touching the verities of the faith that is characteristic of Christian manliness.

Second, I will put practices which, although small in themselves, have as it seems to me an unhappy effect in divine service. I mean the length of the private prayers which the priest celebrating uses; for his own edification, no doubt, but rather to the undue lengthening of the service and to the weariness of the communicants. And with this is indirectly connected the use of forms printed on altar cards, which seem to me to be in danger of becoming an unauthorised and, indeed, unwarranted intrusion into the due order of the Church. I am afraid that I may shock some of you in speaking of these things now; but I am not going to lay a burden upon anyone.

Private Devotions at Public Services.

The service of Holy Communion is quite long enough for anyone who has not a very well disciplined and sustained power of keeping his mind fixed on a spiritual act. The fact is patent to our experience, and it is a fact which is a growing consideration in days in which we have got into the way of doing things generally much more rapidly than we used to do. We know how, within a limit of years that the younger clergy can realise, we have had to sever the celebration of the Holy Communion from the Morning Prayers and Litany, and how, practically, the Communion service is shortened by the omission of the longer exhortation, and sometimes, however unwarrantably, of the Ten Commandments and prayer for the Queen : and some of us know also how, in the case of very large Communions, frequent application is made for the relaxation of the rule of speaking the words of administration to each communicant. Now I do not think that this is the result of any desire in the congregations to withdraw any portion from the time given on Sundays to divine worship. I believe it to be owing to the fact that in all things of the kind we are coming to more prompt and rapid action. Boys do not love their parents less because they write very short letters from school instead of the very long ones they used to write. The sound man of business tries to say what he has to say on the first page of his letters. All matters of function, lay as well as ecclesiastical, are simplified and shortened ; and the weariness of detail is abridged both in church and office. What is done is not less well done because it is attempted, as the elections of Bishops used to be, "*Una voce et una inspiratione.*" If the priest at the Lord's Table lengthens his private devotions to the wearying of his people, he is not acting wisely or thoughtfully. There should be no hurry, there should be no tedium : sometimes there are both.

It may be said, let the communicants have private devotions as well as the priest, then there can be no tedium ; and there are abundant materials in the manuals for the use of communicants that are very edifying in the use.

But upon the use of such manuals there is always this drawback, that they tend to divert the minds of those who use them from the act of united worship, and so reduce the celebration to a ceremony which belongs to the priest alone. We find extreme cases of this in foreign churches, where we see the ordinary worshipper busy with his Prayer Book quite irrespective of what is going on at the altar. There may be an edifying side to this, probably there is, but it is not consistent with the idea of joint acts of worship, least of all with a real partaking in the highest of such acts. The proper use of the private manuals by the congregation is to fill up the unavoidable periods of waiting, either whilst the table is being arranged or whilst the communicants are receiving. I conclude that the service as we have it in our Prayer Books involves a spiritual effort quite sufficient for the capacity of the ordinary worshipper, and that it is best done where the effort is sustained without break. I add that in these circumstances the priest is bound to consider the congregation even before himself ; to make his preparation beforehand and not to prolong the waiting of the people whilst he prays. The use of the altar cards, which contain only the forms of our Liturgy, or such short ejaculatory thoughts as the celebrant may well carry through the merely mechanical process of preparing the table, are lawful and useful ; but I cannot speak too strongly in condemnation of the use of such adjuncts, when they prescribe supplementary acts of ceremonial or additional prayers, conceived and expressed as they sometimes are in language distinctly discordant with the due order of the Church, with the reasonable and harmonious continuity of the liturgical service.

Non-communicating Attendance.

I do not propose now to speak of non-communicating attendance : I must, however, mention the case in which the priest is sometimes obliged either to celebrate without the regular number of communicants or to discontinue the celebration after he has begun it. Where there is a purpose to celebrate without communicants at all, only spectators,

I think that words of condemnation can scarcely be too strong. Three communicants are required by the rubric at least.

There is no rule that does not admit of exception; accident may prevent one of three intending communicants from approaching the table at the moment; the celebration has gone too far, the consecration is completed. The exception must be allowed. But provision ought to be made to preclude the necessity of such exception; it must be a very small parish in which the communicants are so few that only three can be relied on at the regular celebration; or the clergyman must either have lost his hold on them or multiplied celebrations to an extent that gives occasion for the defeasance. Such cases, however, must be uncommon, and do not call for any particular animadversion; let proper care be taken that there be a sufficient number present; if accidents occur to make the keeping of the rule impossible, the circumstances amount to justification.

I am afraid that I cannot justify in any such way any evasion of the rule of the Church which would warrant reservation for the use of the sick, or others outside the Church, to whom the elements might be taken immediately after or even during the service in Church. Something might no doubt be said for the reasonableness of such indulgence, but it is against the letter of the Prayer Book, as I read it, unmistakably.

Evening Communions.

I have left to the last the two burning questions, Evening Communion and Fasting Communion. I will be brief and cautious about both, for I have no wish to wound any susceptibilities, or to lay down propositions which are unpractical. In my own attitude to the practice of evening Communion I have followed, in the diocese of Chester, the example of my illustrious predecessor, Bishop Jacobson, and in this diocese that of Bishops Wilberforce and Mackarness. But I have laid down no rule, nor attempted to enforce any change on practices which I found recog-

nised or established. It would have been neither useful nor expedient to attempt to enforce such change even if I had wished it. But I have never concealed or thought of concealing from the clergy that I do not approve of evening Communion; and that any clergyman who introduces it where it has not been used before does so in disregard of my express advice. I repeat the words which I said at Chester in respect to this: "I am not disposed to set forth injunctions which will not be obeyed, or to offer recommendations which will not be adopted; neither am I going to censure those clergymen whose position and exigencies seem to themselves a justification for continuing the practice. But I must distinctly say that any clergyman who shall hereafter introduce evening Communion into his Church will do it in direct opposition to my deliberate opinion." As to the argumentative aspects of the case, I will not go into detail: the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury will probably very shortly issue its report on this as well as on the question of fasting Communion. Only I will say that I do not think that the fact of our Lord's instituting the sacrament in the evening has the slightest bearing on the question as it now presents itself; that I believe with the best authorities that the practice of the Church from the fourth century onwards should be our rule as regards the special point of evening celebration; that I think that the communicant will be very much more likely to benefit by a communion which he makes an effort to attend than by one that is adapted to minister to his convenience at the end of the day; and that my strongest feelings are called into action by the fact that these evening Communion are being forced, as a party measure of reprisal or compensation, by people who regard the recent judgment on the Lincoln case as a concession to the Church party which they are opposing. Such measures of reaction and reprisal carry their own moral refutation with them. I must honestly add that I very much fear that, both before this and now, the most prominent advocates of the practice are to be found amongst those who would

avowedly depress the doctrine and practice of our Church to the level of opinions which Articles, Liturgy, and Catechism, distinctly repudiate. I do not wish to include in this general censure any clergyman whose course, as it seems to him, is clearly dictated by the circumstances of his flock. The controversial treatment of it is, I think, most profane, and absolutely unwarrantable, either by considerations of law, history, general reasonableness, or pious economy.

Fasting Communion.

The practice of fasting Communion, that is of going to Communion before any of the meals of the day, is also a question about which, owing to the way in which it is pressed as a rigorous rule, there are just now great searchings of heart. This also is before a Committee of Convocation, in consequence of a memorial from the Lower House headed by the names of Bishop Mitchinson and other faithful men whom we know well. I do not intend to speak now on the controversial points involved in this question; for it is certain to my mind that where it can be arranged so, it is best for us all to go to the sacrament early, before the cares even of a Sabbath Sunday begin, and accordingly before any meal. I cannot persuade myself that the mere fact of being in a fasting condition can have any effect on a spiritual reception, although, of course, the reverse does not hold. But when I am told that to go to Communion not fasting is a sin, or even a deadly sin; that to induce your parishioners to attend a midday Communion, before which they have broken their fast, is to lead them into sin, I decline altogether to accept such law, or any law which creates new sins of the kind. It is a wholesome rule, a *mos pro lege*, if you like, which recommends or prescribes fasting Communion; but to enforce such a practice with such sanctions, is not in accordance with the true conception of religious law, or with the spirit of the Gospel itself. Nor is the promulgation of such a sanction—if you communicate otherwise than fasting you are committing wilful sin—

reconcilable with the loyalty that all of us alike owe to the Church, of which we are the ministers.

I will just add that, when I am asked, as I sometimes am, by young clergymen to dispense them from the rule of fasting in this connexion, I am quite willing to give them such counsel, comfort, and latitude of action as they may think it in my power to give, or I can express in words that do not claim for me a power which I am not at all sure rests with me. But I cannot take on myself to dispense with any law that is of universal obligation, either by public document or by private indulgence. I cannot make lawful in Lent things which are not lawful in Lent, nor indeed can I always reconcile the idea of dispensation which my friends the applicants hold, with any practical jurisdiction belonging to my office. Still, as I said, my counsel and sympathy are at the service of all who come to me in good faith and with honest questionings : that may well be enough.

Disestablishment and Disendowment.

We are brought now, and that rather suddenly, to face the greatest problem of modern Society in the relation of Church and State. Suddenly, I mean, because, although the question of disestablishment in many phases has been before us for many years, the Welsh Suspensory Bill has put a point to the front which is distinctly and immediately urgent, and has done so in a way that admits of no disguise as to its intention, or misapprehension as to its results. It means, whatever else it means, disestablishment for the whole Church of England, sooner or later, wholesale or piecemeal, but pure and simple. And such an attack involves the need of a defence all round ; not merely political or moral or ecclesiastical ; not merely speculative and theoretical, merely argumentative or academic ; or merely practical ; not only on the grounds of authority, history, and sentiment, not only on the grounds of expediency and economy, not only on general or only on particular and local arguments ; it must be a defence all round. This defence is a very large subject, and I cannot pretend to deal with it in one section or even in two sections

of a charge. But I am bound to deal with it: and if I do it at too great length for the occasion, or in such detached sections as may seem, each by itself, to lack unity and connexion, I must trust the clergy to consider the several sections as a whole; or, if they will not do that, to endeavour to try to gather from the particular one to which they may listen, some hints on principles, arguments, and methods, such as one independent thinker may wisely condescend to borrow from another.

You may remember that when, eight years ago, a dis-establishment attack seemed imminent, and the Church Defence Institution set to work in earnest to promote defensive work, the Church, both as a spiritual body and as a national institution, was assailed on both sides of projected attack and projected reconstruction. Sound teaching on both these phases was started and with good effect, and both by the circulation of papers, and by the agency of illustrative lectures, great efforts were and have been since continuously made, to bring before all classes of our people the truth of the History of our Church. The lines on which this defence is conducted are excellent, and under other circumstances I might almost be inclined to throw myself on the materials that that organisation furnishes; but it appears to me now most necessary that we should review and realise the situation, each clergyman, each Christian Englishman for himself, and renew and refresh his knowledge of the arguments on which so much depends. Matters have moreover changed somewhat since 1886; we hear less of reconstruction, but more of demolition.

It is a curious thing, not unprecedented, that we have at the same moment advancing upon us, not I believe with any conscious concert, but yet in a way that tends to disturb the faith of some in the strength of our cause, detachments from the Roman as well as from what I will, using a name of which I believe the party I mean is proud and content to inherit it, call the Puritan party. On both sides our character as an historic institution and a spiritual body is called in question: our Church order and govern-

ment, our orders of ministry, our doctrinal teaching, our relations to the Catholic Church and the English nation, our historic claim to be the national Church, and the efficacy of our moral and spiritual work. The Roman attacks on our succession, on our constitutional position and on our rights, move of course on quite different theories and principles from those of the Puritans, but the denials are still denials, and the minds that are shaken on the one side are not fortified by being shaken on the other. There are signs of large and ostentatious claims to be made just now by Rome, and there are clever and ingenious, candidly ingenious methods of suggesting doubts and questions to men who ought to be more informed than mere controversial reading can ever make them, which I confess give me personally much trouble. Not only has this side of things been vigorously pressed, but the great publicity and public interest with which the recent changes in the Roman hierarchy have been viewed, the prominence assigned in the papers to Roman ceremonials and the utterances of Roman leaders have, to some extent, stimulated feeling and inquiry in controversial directions. Some points of this character I may have to recur to, but now I dismiss them that we may review our position on the greater questions.

Terminology.

We begin by asking ourselves what do we mean by the terms we use? What do we mean by Church, State, National Church, Establishment, Endowment, Reformation, Liberation, or at least some of them? What is the Church, our Church, our national Church?

(a) The Church.

Well—begin at the beginning; begin with the article of the Creed: the one, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. What do I believe about it or mean by it? I believe that our Lord founded, and by His Holy Spirit, through the agency of His apostles, organised a body of believers, to which He gave a corporate constitution and spiritual life. This, His own mystical body, I believe, is to abide for ever

and to gather in all nations ; and I believe it to possess, in His contemplation and purpose, a unity and a holiness which to me are a matter of Faith ; and a catholic and apostolic character which may be tested by history and experience. The unity, as a matter of faith, I believe to exist in the determinate purpose implied in our Lord's own prayer that all may be one ; and I also believe that Almighty God, seeing not as we see, has regard to the unity of faith and service, in communities and individuals that do not see such unity or even try to feel it themselves ; having a good purpose that one day it shall be fully manifested. The holiness, as a matter of faith, I believe to exist in His sanctification and consecration of the body of the faithful, whom He is leading on, individually and collectively, to a like consummation. The unity and holiness I believe to subsist, notwithstanding the divisions and unworthiness of individual members and sections, and even in spite of their unconsciousness or even repudiation of the idea ; for the Church is an institution working in the world, and administered by men who have no immunity either for themselves or for their methods from the trials to which all other institutions are liable. The catholicity and apostolicity of the Church I believe to be matter of theological and historical proof : and I would work to vindicate the claim involved in this, to apostolic orthodoxy in doctrine, continuity in holy orders and historic authority in government and rites : although I would do it constructively and not litigiously, without attempting to make such definitions as would seem to limit the action of divine grace through agencies which do not possess these characteristics. Even if they say that they are not of the body, I would leave it to the great Head to determine whether it is so or not.

(b) The Church of England.

Next, what is the Church of England ? The Church of England I hold to be a portion of this Holy Catholic, Apostolic, One Church, which is the presentation, and contact of the same, to us and our nation and country ;

and in which we and our fellow-Churchmen realise our own condition as members of the mystical body of the Lord. I believe that I am justified in this by the evidence which I have of the continuity of faith, of apostolic order and succession, of ministry and service, and I am desirous to uphold my belief, notwithstanding the claims and assumptions of attacking parties, Roman or Puritan. We unchurch no one, so far as I can see, but claim and hold fast what we have received. We can even see that those who declare that they are not of the body, are in the sight of the Lord other than their words would suggest: but now we are asserting our own claim.

The Church of England is the national Church: the institution or community or body, whose continuous work has been the conversion of the nation, its organisation for the maintenance of Christian belief and practice; the preservation and translation of the Scriptures; its share in the work of civilisation, education, and philanthropic enterprise; as well as in the exercise of moral influence towards order, peace, and national progress:—and this all working in and through the direct bearing of teaching and discipline on individuals, as the contact of the mystical body of the Lord, and the realised presentment to them of the Holy Catholic Church.

Now what do we mean by the nation and the State?

(c) The Nation.

By the nation we mean our people as a whole, in the several stages of their growth, and now in their full growth and integrity. I do not disregard the variety of origins out of which a nationality has constituted itself. There is a sense in which the United Kingdom is a nationality, but it is a secondary sense: on the other hand Scotland is a nation, although anciently Alban, Dalriada, and Strathclyde were three varieties of race and history; and England is a nation, although once the Teutonic element was ranged in seven kingdoms and the Celtic elements in two or three more. The nation has grown up as one and is one; and it will be a grievous thing if ever the cleavage

of ancient tribalism is allowed to regain, even in sentiment, its disruptive force. The Church of England is the Church of the nation of England.

(d) The State.

But what is the State? for now it is not so much primarily the relation of the Church to the nation as its relation to the State that is in question; at least the points ought not to be confounded. The State, properly, is the nation in its constitutional organisation for its own well-being as a secular unity: for national action, administration, policy, self-preservation, and intercourse with other states and nations. It is the *res publica*, the commonwealth in its temporal or secular aspect as organised. The word is not identical in meaning with the word nation, although the two may be co-extensive in actual membership and composition. A nation has its character, its property, its history, its sentiments, in a sense in which the State has not, or at all events not the same. The clergy for instance are ministers of the nation, not ministers of the State: the property of all public bodies may be regarded as national property or public property, but it is not the property of the State; and Church property itself, and indeed all property which the action of the law secures to its owners, may be and is sometimes called national property, as we well know, although I am not aware that either expression is warranted by the strict language of English law; but it is not the property of the State. We must leave to the lawyers the determination of the distinctions between public, national, and State property, and guard ourselves against the confusion, so often wilfully utilised for political purposes, between terms that sound very much alike but have very different meanings. The Church is, it is true, the Church of the State as well as of the nation; but not in the same sense. As a matter of fact, the unity of the Church is much more ancient than the unity of the State; the institutions of the Church than the institutions of the State; the property of the Church than the property of the State. Moreover, in

its relations to the rest of the body of the Catholic Church, of East and West, the Church of England has a character and position of solid unity of idea and history, which only by a very distant sort of analogy one European or Asiatic state can be said to have in its relations to another.

(e) Endowment.

Then comes endowment and establishment. Endowment means the acquisition by the Church of lands and tithes, either given by individuals to special churches and parishes, or acquired by the operation of the law and custom of ancient Christianity on which the system of tithe is based. In both cases the endowment arises from property which never was State property in any true sense, and it was provided by gifts, which although recognised as valid by the administrators, who at any particular time represented the idea of the State, did not proceed from the State in any true corporate capacity. The property of the Church has in great measure an immemorial title; and in the Welsh counties, I believe, one beyond the age of record, for the Christianity of Wales is, as I shall state by-and-by, the most ancient portion of the whole fabric of Church institution in these islands, and the property in the westernmost provinces far away the most ancient possessions of the Church. I do not think that, in a survey of argument that is necessarily so broad as I am now taking, I am at all called on to go into detail into the controversies about tithe and title.

(f) Establishment.

Establishment means, in practical politics and general terms, the recognition of the Church of England as the national organisation for the Christian religion; of her ministers as an estate of the realm, and of the rule that the Sovereign is the supreme governor in causes ecclesiastical as well as temporal; this involves the authorisation of the exercise of the inherent powers of the Church as a spiritual organisation, and the undertaking to enforce her authority where it is used in conformity with the law of

the land. The Church of England is thus established not by any single act of State or nation, but by continuous and repeated recognitions of her character and legal powers.

When we come, then, to the meaning of disestablishment and disendowment there can be little or no controversy as to the meaning of terms. I think that, using words which I have used on other occasions and that with a good deal of careful consideration, I may put matters thus :—

The Power of the State.

As to the power and right of the State in matters of endowment and establishment, we must maintain and allow :

1. (a) That the State has *absolute power* to limit, alienate, and regulate the use of endowments, as of all property whatever ; not only is such power an essential part of sovereignty, but its exercise is amply proved by laws, and by the action of the kings and parliaments before the Reformation, at the Reformation, and since.

(b) That the State has the *right* to use such power, where it is necessary or expedient, by way of correction or improvement.

2. (a) That the State has absolute power to withdraw all coercive validity from ecclesiastical acts of authority.

(b) That the State has the *right* to do this only on proof of abuse, or when and where the exercise of such ecclesiastical authority is opposed to the interest of the nation.

No constitutional power or right to limit private benefaction or to interfere with the exercise of freedom of conscience in the matters of faith, worship, or administration, can be regarded as inherent in the State as a moral agent of government, although historically, from time to time, it has so interfered with various critical results.

Complementary to these propositions I shall submit this further :—

The Church of England is a religious body with distinct principles of belief and constitution, and a certain relation to historical and catholic Christianity, which it cannot alter

or part with without forfeiting its essential character ; and which the State, so long as it deals with the Church as a corporate institution, recognises as integral, and consistent with the terms on which it so deals, either by suffering it to hold property or to exercise a coercive jurisdiction.

If it is proposed to alter the relations which I have tried thus very briefly to define, that is, to disendow and disestablish, we ask why? and we certainly cannot complain of the variety and abundance, whilst we demur as to the adequacy, of the answers. I take it, however, that we must be prepared to do more than disprove or dispute the cogency of these arguments against us ; we must try to vindicate both the idea and the working of the Church we are defending. If this cannot be done without occasionally exchanging blows with the attacking party, we must face the responsibility ; and at all events we can avoid personal disputes of fact and allegation. I think it well to be even over-cautious in using such words as sacrilege, robbery, and spoliation in reference to the alienation or expropriation which is involved in this discussion. But it is not to be ignored that the method proposed seems directed rather to the deprivation of the Church than to the acquisition or improved disposal of its revenues, and thus has not the excuse which simple and natural covetousness might plead. The lessons derived from the history of these European countries in which such confiscations have taken place, are an ample warning that no real social or political interest is permanently served by the momentary transfer of endowments which almost immediately are merged in the mass of ordinary property.

The statements on which, ordinarily, the demand for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church is based, are very speculative and very vague ; or, if not speculative and vague, are in the highest degree irrelevant to the real issues. When we are told that an endowed and legally established national Church is a thing mistaken in idea and opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, we have a specimen of the vague and speculative ; and when we are told that

freedom of religious opinion demands the liberation of the Church from State control, we are warranted, I think, in regarding the assertion as irrelevant. There is a further argument drawn from the theory that our own Church has failed in her mission, has misused her means and opportunities, has set class against class, and made herself the Church of a class, which function the nation or the majority of it repudiates; and here we find ourselves in a region of controversy in which speculation, relevant and irrelevant, facts and figures, proved or disproved, are mixed up in a medley which is by no means conducive to clearness of either idea or practical action.

The theory of a working of the Church so completely removed from material influences as to be able to dispense with either law or property, has at several periods of the world's history been mooted, and occasionally tried. It was mooted in one form by the Mendicant orders before the Reformation; it was dogmatically propounded by Wycliffe and other reformers, who dated the beginning of Anti-Christianism from the conversion of Constantine. But no practical action ever came out of a theory so unpractical. The Mendicants became established, and, if not legally endowed, still amply provided for in the first generation; the Wycliffites and all similar schools of theorists, either did not act at all on their principles, or sustained the action of their poor preachers by the subsidies of richer patrons. Their projects fell together with the semi-socialism with which politically, perhaps almost accidentally, they came into alliance. And so it has been with all subsequent developments of the kind.

That the particular form which endowment and establishment have taken in the Church History of Western Europe is opposed either to the spirit or to the letter of the Gospel, has been and is still somewhat positively asserted. That any passages of the Gospel, or any example of the early workers of the Church, reasonably interpreted, have ever been adduced to prove the assumption with any approach to logical probability, I think may be safely denied. The whole current of that Church life,

which, whether ideal or not, has been the real stream of the history by which the Gospel has been delivered to all nations, has proceeded on the lines to which we are holding. The very communities which assail the Church are unable to dispense with the conditions which they have inherited or borrowed. The idea may be worn out and may be liable to be superseded, but it is the idea by which the outward life of Christianity has been hitherto, in very great measure, moulded since the first days of the Church.

That the freedom of religious opinion has been limited by the action of established churches is a matter of history of course ; and a matter of history which contains many pages that are very grievous reading ; pages full of mistaken policies, persecutions, and over-definings, against which the whole of the present current of religious thought is set in steady protest. But it must not be forgotten that the very idea of a religious community, whether established or not, involves a limitation or definition of the terms of fellowship, which is a limitation of freedom, however freely accepted, and that the enforcement of such terms, and inculcation of the articles necessary to maintain and propagate such community, involves a discipline which only in degree differs from the discipline of proper ecclesiastical law as at any time administered. It is of course a duty with those who are strongly convinced of truth and of the vital necessity of maintaining and propagating it, to do their best to educate others in that truth and to take the best means of counteracting the errors opposed to it. Certainly the means taken for doing this have not always been the wisest : whether we read of Charles the Great's conversion of the Saxons, or the working of the Test Acts at home, or the Jesuit missions in the Eastern and Western worlds, we find instances that prove how, with the best will, the worst possible measures have been taken. We do not express any astonishment when we find the iniquity of means remembered when the benefit of the end is forgotten. But we cannot let ourselves be made responsible for what is practically repudiated now all along the line of thought ; and we believe that our Church,

established as it is, has been completely, yes more completely than the communities that attack her, delivered from the bondage of the mistaken policy with which all administration of Church and State alike was so long encumbered and defiled.

Liberation.

The liberation of the Church of England from State control, if it were a claim made by the Church itself, as it sometimes is made by enthusiastic and short-sighted Churchmen, would be a very different thing from that which is asked for under that name now. It is not a candid or ingenuous way of putting the watchword of a cause which at all events ought to be plainspoken and to have the courage of conviction. The liberation that seems to be really asked for by the promoters of such schemes is the destruction of all bonds of doctrinal, ritual, and disciplinary organisation by which the Church of England as an institution, living amongst institutions, maintains its definite position and does its work.

That the Church has misused its means and position for personal or political, party or secular ends, has made itself the Church of a class and lost sight of another class, is a sort of charge on which appeal must be made to fact and history from time to time ; but it is an appeal that must be decided on the principles that were applicable at the time the charge itself applies. It seems to me that, at times at which the great question of national interest was the maintenance of the Church, the clergy and the Churchmen of the day should, out of loyalty to their convictions, support the party in the State that supported them. It seems to me natural and reasonable. That they should support the party in measures which were outside of Church defence, and in themselves perhaps disapproved by the better instinct of Churchmen, is a matter which, whether in the sixteenth century, or the seventeenth, or the nineteenth, is to be regretted ; but I should be very much surprised if anyone were to deny that it is of the very essence of party politics that such things should happen, and that, if to be

regretted, yet it is not inexcusable, and certainly does not require to be excused in answer to men and parties which avowedly are acting upon the same lines.

That the Church of England has become the church of a class, a minority, by the failure of her attempts to carry into effect the work with which God has, as we believe, entrusted her ; has so failed that her continuance in her position is rather a hindrance than a furtherance to the prosecution of the work of national Christianity, is a question of truth or untruth. There is no evidence that we are in a minority : it is not *we* that object to what is called a religious census. There are very convincing reasons, convincing that is, in the default of such a census as would *primâ facie* determine it, that the majority of Englishmen are faithful to the Church. There is a sense in which an advancing, teaching, missionary Church must always be a minority, a little leaven leavening the whole lump. But, if it were not so and were proved not to be so, it would still be the duty of Churchmen to try to strengthen the Establishment by remedying faults and improving means and methods, and not, in despair, allow themselves to be regarded as defeated, and to behave as having no longer a stake in the religious welfare of their people. But I will not enlarge on this; no man who can at all realise the work that has been done of late years, and that is being done now, can deny that the Church of England is stronger in the efficiency of her work and in the affection of her children than she ever was before ; more hopeful, more full of prayer, and earnest self-devotion, and thoroughly catholic and English sympathies. These are scarcely the characteristics of failure ; they may be incitements to attack. If we are called upon, as we often are, to justify our *raison d'être*, by result rather than by history, I believe, and I am convinced that our country believes that we are well able to vindicate our name and position by the character and completeness of work that we are doing and by our thorough realisation of our great responsibility.

It is one thing to attempt answers, which addressed to loose arguments must be, to some extent, loose in their

texture. It is another thing to point out the mischiefs that such radical methods of dealing with the Church must involve; and yet another to indicate the positive advantages, outside of the region of these objections, which justify us in maintaining the present status of the Church of England. But the things are inextricably connected, and, to avoid repetition, I must take them briefly together.

Summary.

(1) The Church of England is the exponent of one, and that the most important and sacred part of the history of national life. To disestablish it would constitute a break in the continuity of national life so far as all the sacred influences go, and a renunciation of historic unity. I do not say that it is the whole string of the continuity, but it is one of the strands of the string, the breaking of which weakens the whole. We can read some illustrations of what this means in the History of France since the Revolution of 1789.

(2) The Church of England, by its parochial organisation, places a centre of religious life and energy in every district of the kingdom: an agency of culture and missionary work which cannot be left to mere voluntary forces. To disestablish it would break up this system, and entail the loss of an organisation by which for ages the influences of charity, morality, and culture have been brought into working in every part of the country; and the comforts of religion and the helps that result from religious sincerity in practice have been brought within the reach of every individual of the nation. This cannot be denied; and the result of so deep and fundamental a change would be to risk a fall back into absolute barbarism.

(3) The Church of England maintains the authority of spiritual doctrine, order, and government, on the principles of historical and theological catholicity. To abolish her national position would be to place the authority which she represents on a level, in relation to the State and nation, with that of congregational associations, existing in the eye of the law by virtue of mere contract. A teaching

Church cannot be maintained on the gifts of those whose unwillingness to learn is the first obstacle that has to be overcome; and every national Church must be a missionary Church. A really teaching Church must teach with authority, and not be dependent on the gifts of those who may use the power of the purse to modify the teaching. The measure of disestablishment would thus devolve all the duties and responsibilities of the nation for religious matters on voluntary and unauthorised adventure, which would have no inherent element of unity. This might, under certain circumstances, especially in the contemplation of the action of the Roman Church, amount to a national renunciation of the belief in the Holy Catholic Church, and so far be a blow to the existence of Christianity in the whole world.

(4) We humbly believe that to the English nation has been entrusted at this moment, a mission of stupendous and vital import, as the great colonising, civilising, and Christianising agency of the world. The disestablishment of the Church would be a practical renunciation, on the part of the nation, of the duty of fulfilling what is spiritually the great object of the mission—a renunciation which, however and whenever, if ever, it comes, can only be regarded by Englishmen with shame and horror.

Romans and Puritans.

I have referred more than once to the circumstances in which the controversy as to the status of the Church of England is at present being treated by Roman Catholic and Puritan writers, in curious relation to one another, and yet, so far as the results of their criticisms are concerned, tending to the same end: the rejection of the claim of the Church of England as the national and historical Church which her members believe her to be. It is to be observed further that not only in the Puritan school within and without the Church, but in a class of scholars who have carefully studied the Reformation history, there has prevailed a pessimistic interpretation of much of the character and phenomena of that most critical period which lends

itself to the support of the destructive theory. Such points, then, as the apostolic succession in the English episcopate, the continuity of the historical corporeity of the English Church, *i.e.* the corporate identity of the Church before and after the Reformation; the moral character of the greater agents in the changes that attended it; the authority by which the symbolic books of the Church, the Prayer Book and Articles, were originally set forth and accepted;¹ the character of the measures by which the uniformity of public worship was enforced from the reign of Elizabeth onwards, and the persecution to which Nonconformists and Roman Catholics were subjected; the settlement of the relations between Church and State during the century and a half which followed the breach with the Roman see—all of them subjects on which a great deal has been written in former years, and new materials of record and illustration are constantly being turned up—form a very considerable material for active controversy. Anyone who fairly considers the subject must allow that a great deal may be said on both sides on most of these points, and that when and where they are argued on different prin-

¹ I refer to the question whether the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. was approved by Convocation; a matter which involves a point of fact and a point of law. As to the fact, records being lost, it may be said to depend primarily on the letter of Edward or his Council to Bonner, in which this is distinctly affirmed. There are difficulties about the dates which may, in the event of record discoveries, be enough to disprove it. As to the matter of law, although certainly it would have been greatly to be desired that the Convocation should as experts approve the Book, the authority of the Bishops was the real constitutional authority for approving of a reformed Ritual, and the relation of the Church to the Crown at the moment was not without a meaning, however much we may deprecate the application in the circumstances. The Book had such authority as the national Church at the moment could give.

Another point is the construction put upon the commissions which Henry VIII. and Edward VI. compelled the Bishops to take out, by which they were empowered by virtue of the royal authority to execute all portions of episcopal jurisdiction *preter et ultra ea quæ ex sacris litteris divinitus commissæ esse dinoscuntur*. These commissions, humiliating and unwarrantable on any ground of precedent as they were, were certainly no reconstitution of a new system of Church government, nor a breach with the old; and they were very soon disused. They are now alleged to mark the foundation by the King of a new Church government, and indeed a new Church.

ciples from three different standing grounds, the great deal that may be said is almost indefinitely multiplied. A great deal has to be read and written no doubt still, and on most of the points we may conclude very confidently that the several schools will never come to agreement as to either fact or principle. That the general result, to minds arguing on the principles which I believe to be true, is to justify the Church of England triumphantly in her claim to be the national Church, I have no hesitation in affirming. But it is unsafe to shelter one's self under a general conclusion and to refuse to face the strong assertions of the adversary's strong points; and accordingly those who undertake a share of Church defence must acquaint themselves with the leading facts of the several controversies. They must also prepare themselves to be called on to answer questions that cannot be solved, to produce evidence of things of which no evidence, that will silence a gainsayer, can possibly be produced, and to pass judgment on the character of men and measures, the credit or the odium of which clings to the body in whose cause the men worked and the measures were adopted. I can now only indicate one or two of the points that have to be kept in mind.

Apostolic Succession.

I will take, first, the point of the apostolic succession of the episcopate, as being an important factor in the argument of the continuous life of the English Church. And by this I mean not merely the institution of the three orders in the ministry, but the transmission of the apostolic commission from hand to hand, which is what is generally meant by the apostolic succession. This is assailed by those Roman Catholics who affirm that Archbishop Parker and the Elizabethan Bishops were not duly consecrated; that Barlow, who was the senior of the Bishops who officiated at the consecration of Parker, was never consecrated himself; that the ritual which was used on the occasion was not an adequate ritual; that the whole element of mission was absent, the consecrating Bishops

having no right of mission, and that in point of fact, the whole transaction being without warrant from the see of Rome, the consecration, such as it was, was invalid ; we have neither orders nor mission, and the community which we belong to has only a secular or a parliamentary title to the name we claim, if even that.

The Puritan argument, denying altogether the need of apostolic succession, and summarily rejecting the claim of the episcopate to primitive authority or historic descent, comes to the same conclusion : there is no such thing as apostolic succession, and the whole fabric based upon the assumption is a false pretence to authority, not only baseless in itself, but used as an instrument for exclusion of faithful Christians from the privileges to which they are entitled as believers, and as a ground of persecution against those who reject the form of government to which it belongs. Then comes in the assertion of another school that the men who carried on the work of Reformation and Church government during the first age of the Reformation did not believe it themselves ; and that of a diametrically opposite school, that the importance of Holy Orders in the Church of England is used as a weapon or implement to unchurch other communities of Christians, whilst the doctrine of the historic episcopate is a comparatively modern invention in relation to the Church of England, and in fact a figment, so far as we are concerned, of what is called the Tractarian revival.

Parker's Consecration.

The answer to the Roman Catholic argument must be found in the careful study of the record in which the consecration of the Elizabethan prelates is described, and in the analysis of the ritual used. It will then appear that Parker was consecrated by four Bishops, all using the proper words of consecration and joining in the act of transmission, three of them known, by actual record of day and place, to have been lawfully consecrated, and the one whose record of consecration is missing having been constantly recognised as a Bishop until a new controversy

arose on other principles ; and it being certain that, so far as circumstantial evidence can be of use, his consecration was a fact of legal and historical authenticity. The proof is abundant, moreover, that the ritual used was, both as to form and as to matter, one adequate according to all liturgical authority in the history of the Church ; and that the mission, as effected by the order of canonical election and the precedents of the English Church, was as regular and complete as it could be made. The one thing wanting in the eyes of the Roman Catholic was the papal approbation ; with this all other defects would have been cured ; without it all other completeness of detail was absolutely null. It is not too much to say that, whilst in public and private discussion the controversialist suggests every conceivable objection, and I had almost said cavil, on this point, to every mind that, uninformed or partially informed, can be inclined in the direction of doubt, it is impossible to find one who would grant, that, were the whole array of arguments proved against him, he would recognise the validity of English Orders. I do not care to characterise this sort of controversy, but I do deprecate it when it takes the line of disputing such obscure points as, who gave priest's orders to Archbishop Tillotson, or was there not something uncertain about the canonical ordination of Archbishop Potter ; or was Secker, or Butler, or this, that, and the other, regularly baptised.

The arguments of the Puritans against episcopacy altogether are of course quite beyond a possibility of handling now : and they turn on quite a different sort of evidence. But the statements as to the historic use of the term "apostolic succession" in the Church of England, and the modern idea of its real acceptance, may be dismissed briefly. Up to the period of the Reformation there was no other idea of episcopacy except that of transmission of apostolic commission : that the ministry of the episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until Bugenhagen reconstituted a nominal episcopate in Denmark, and this was an example not likely to be taken in England ; nor was it so accepted.

There is, then, no occasion to test the writings of the Elizabethan divines in search of traces of a belief in their own official existence. Archbishop Parker's own work on the history of the Church of England suffices to prove the importance which he attached to succession. A catena of authorities from the days of Hooker onwards is framed without much trouble. The use of the exact term apostolic succession is a matter that involves a little more research, but it is forthcoming. The work of Mason, on the English episcopate, the language of Bishop Forbes of Aberdeen, in the seventeenth century, of Bishop Beveridge, in his work on the Articles, of Law and Wesley, and of the American Prayer Book of 1805, not to speak of books that were written between 1805 and 1833, are enough to prove that there is no element of innovation or invention in question; but whether or not the two words are in common use, the writings of Mason, Jeremy Taylor, Bramhall, and Lindsay on the material point are sufficient to prove that the doctrine was definitely held. It is not to be denied that, like many other great truths which controversy has done its worst to smother, the great meaning and force both of word and thing needed, and still needs, to be more fully realised.

I have spoken at length about this, both because it is a very representative point in these controversies and because it is the one which is most frequently forced on me in private correspondence by people among whom doubts and difficulties have arisen about the details. I do not myself attach to the minutiae of the controversy any such importance as would lead me for one instant to limit the working of divine grace or to denounce the validity of ministerial acts, by the production or non-production of documentary evidence upon the points at issue. I cannot think that the welfare of a national Church could, in the eye of Almighty God, be counted to depend on the fact that Barlow sat or stood at Parker's consecration, or that his own position and ministerial work is annulled because his register is lost. The other matters that I would refer to must be more briefly dismissed.

Historical Misrepresentations.

We have so long maintained the legal and constitutional continuity of the Church before and after the Reformation that it becomes a matter of mental difficulty to enter into the arguments of those who would deny it; of the Puritan who believes us to be an Act of Parliament Church, and the Romanist who believes that Henry VIII. was our founder. These assertions, no doubt, commend themselves alike to those who believe in no such thing as a visible and organised society of the Church, and to those who believe that the only such Church is that in the communion of the see of Rome. And to address to them arguments that prove an organic constitution and political or ecclesiastico-political independence in a national Church before and since our breach with that see, is to throw arguments away. But our own people should not be left in such ignorance as to make them a ready prey to such misrepresentations—misrepresentations which, out of carelessness, I hope, or the occasional blindness of hasty party writing, are to be found in the works of men such as Macaulay, who, with the historical side of his mind, knew better. It is, however, not on this whole question, but on the particular side of it, the moral and political side of the English Reformation, as affecting the character of the Church of England, and as affected by the moral and political character of the agents of the Reformation itself—on this particular aspect of it, that just now we find indiscriminate pessimism at work within and without our body. Henry VIII. is said to have been a monster of lust; Cranmer and his Bishops time-serving and unfaithful men; the Edwardian ministers devoid of any principle but destructive selfishness; the Elizabethan episcopate a body of ignorant and simoniacal adventurers: the Caroline revival the work of a mad pedant, an impracticable and insincere aspirant to tyranny, and a narrow-minded, unscrupulous, superstitious bigot—whose political programme, restored to some puny vitality in the disgraceful epoch of the Restoration, fell to pieces at the Revolution, leaving us to the dead level of comatose Hanoverianism, on which

and out of which, by a series of revivals and counter-revivals, we have arrived at our present critical state of capacity or incapacity, competency or incompetency, progress or retrogression, as we from our different ends of the avenue may choose to view it. Well, it is not difficult to gather the string of an answer out of such a sorites of pessimism; I might even say that surely there must be something of divine organisation and divine guidance in an institution and history which has persistently continued under such an array of disadvantages, and has done so much good in the world, as its enemies cannot deny. I do say so; and I say it just as confidently as if I were admitting the force and truth of the views of men and measures that I have characterised, for the most part in other men's words. But I do not grant it all; nor do I grant any of it without such modifications as can be enforced by the comparisons of contemporary history and the contemporary standard of the life of public men. Henry VIII. was unquestionably a man of lust, of greed, of cruel and tyrannous self-will. But look at Francis I. and the Valois and Bourbon kings down to Henry IV.: and say to what extent did his lustful, cruel, greedy tyranny affect the course of Church history in the direction of his vices; certainly he wrought great changes, but, where they were changes of moral consequence, they were in the direction of reform of vice and punishment of the very things in which he himself claimed immunity. Were the popes themselves or the kings of Spain, their champions, more consistent in the practice of ordinary heathen virtue? Which of the foreign Churches in attack or defence can be said to have had temporal champions of which the same might not be said? As to the use of a mere *tu quoque* under these circumstances, I need not argue: but ask simply to whom was the education and training of the worldly and time-serving prelates of the period owing? Surely the whole of the Henrician and Edwardian Bishops, and of the Elizabethan, those who set the fashion of the rest, had been brought up under the pressure of the Roman influence which, weakened in all

its moral and spiritual elements by the Renaissance, still held politically the sway over the minds and habits of its own pupils ; even the reaction that followed revulsion by no means turned the dross into gold, or even purged the true gold that was in the best of men from the dross that was common to them with the worst. Yet I do not believe that things were at all so bad as they are made. I do not believe that Hooker, wonderful as he was, was a spiritual miracle, any more than that Bacon from another side was a self-made man, or that Shakespeare was without education or example. The men who made Hooker and Bacon and Shakespeare do not come to the front ; perhaps something of the kind is true in other than Elizabethan history : but the continuity of life is in the spiritual and intellectual world as in the physical : and these men could not have been what they are without a pedigree.

So we come to the agents of persecution and repression : to the Elizabethan enforcement of uniformity and the execution of Roman priests and intransigent puritanical controversialists. Was there in the ideas of men or in the public law of Europe anything better ? Were not the Puritan party the party that hounded on the lawyers against the Roman Catholic priests, in pursuance of a policy that had no small part in the creation of the revolution of the next century ? And was not the policy of the Roman party outside of England even more extravagantly bitter and cruel than that of the Puritans would have been could they have had their own way ? The state of religious life was realised as a state of war, with all the moral evils of a quasi-martial law. Yet men lived through it and religion lived through it, and the Church too ; and, as I read it, with an always progressive tendency to the better.

On this state of things came the Laudian revival and the learned work of the Caroline divines ; but here I stop, for I do not want either to weary you or to transgress the limits of such a discussion as is possible on such an occasion. The result has been, through evil as well as good certainly, growth in strength and efficacy. It is one of the easiest, simplest, and most sickening commonplaces

of controversy to compare the best men of your own side with the worst of your opponent's party; but it is not a commonplace that proves anything or illustrates much beyond its own spirit.

Welsh Disestablishment.

The attack on the Church of England, made in Parliament and by a responsible ministry, long threatened, indeed, by a party, and urged on by promiscuous agitation, has at last come, in a shape which, although not quite unexpected, still has features which could scarcely have been looked for a very few years ago. The Suspensory Bill for the Established Church in Wales is now before the country. This is not the place or the occasion on which I can speculate on the motives which have led its promoters to put it forward in the way they have chosen, or on their selection of a time and opportunity of attack. Impossible as it is to mention the matter at all without referring to the political circumstances, which must shape the policy of its supporters, it is still desirable to refrain from the imputation of views and motives that are not owned by them themselves. It is quite possible that they believe themselves to be actuated by motives which they believe to be the best possible motives. And I cannot, I think, with any sense of what is just or prudent, take it as at all probable that the scheme for proceeding with the disestablishment of the four dioceses of Wales, and the disposal of the property of the churches, which, should the Suspensory Bill pass, must be the next step to be expected, can in any sensible degree correspond with the programme of a Disestablishment Bill which, somehow or other, has found its way into the newspapers. For the present, at all events, I must set these points on one side and try to represent to myself, and to you, the true conditions, which historically, and as a matter of ordinary foresight for the result, must be allowed to exist, and ought to have mature consideration.

That this attack is an attack on the national Church of England there can be in no reasonable mind any manner

of doubt. Whatever the motive is, and whatever the policy, it is a blow aimed at the Church as a whole. And it is a blow aimed not only at the relations between Church and State, but at the very vitality of the Church as an institution; and it is further, if we are to judge of the true feelings of the promoters by their own statements, a blow intended against the government, doctrine, ritual, and discipline which the faithful children of the Church of England believe to be a divine deposit, to be of the very essence of our relation to the General Assembly and Church of the Firstborn. We must not shut our eyes to this. I am sure that there is no need of a caution to loyal Churchmen, that they must not relax in their efforts at resistance in the idea that the attack is only on an outside and weak adjunct of the Establishment, or that it is possible to make a concession, in this case, in order to make the fortification of the rest of the Establishment impregnable. I would not mention such a consideration were it not that I have seen in some of the papers imputations of lukewarmness in defence accounted for by the still grosser imputation of the policy of self-preservation at the cost of Wales—I do not believe in either the hypothesis or the hypothetical excuse for it. Not the less certain, however, is it that the attack is on the Church as a whole, on the Establishment as a whole, on the continuance of the whole historical relations of the whole Church to the State of England, and, as I believe, on religious, perhaps, rather than on social or political grounds, on the Church of England as the Catholic Church. In these last words I am giving credit to the aggressive party for a sincerity of belief which they will surely not repudiate. If they believe us to be the propounders of false doctrine, history, and policy, moral and social dogmas, which they believe to be untrue, they have a sort of justification to their own conscience of the line they are taking and of the mischiefs which they are doing their utmost to make inevitable. Otherwise not. I have no desire to judge them.

I am aware that there is a school of thinkers within the

pale of our own communion which is half prepared to risk the peril of Disestablishment, and not averse to begin the experiment, by concession to the measures now proposed. The idea, apparently, is that our system as it exists at present has become entangled and encumbered with machinery and traditions which are a clog upon spiritual efficiency, inducing strong worldly motives and policies amongst ourselves, and setting in opposition to us strong antipathies, moral and social as well as spiritual, among the classes to whom we are trying to minister ; and accordingly that the Church, retaining all spiritual competence and consistency, would work more effectively if disestablished and disendowed. And this idea is likewise put forward, with what ingenuousness and sincerity I cannot venture to judge, by some of the promoters of the scheme, who at one moment are treating us as anti-Christian, and at another promising us liberty to develop and do free work. In very simple language, Disestablishment, in such advocacy, can mean only the giving the Church rope enough to hang herself. To those of our own people who give way to the argument I have stated, I can but say, as I have said long ago, in St. Paul's Cathedral : Disestablish and disendow the Church of England to-day, and, such is my confidence in the good hand of my God upon her, and my belief in the mission of my people, that I am ready to say that in less than fifty years she would be more powerful in all ways than she is now—but the risk could be run only on the jeopardy of the millions of souls that would be left to ruin in the first stages of the experiment, and it cannot be incurred by us who are in trust, without a certain desertion of our duty, and disloyalty to the cause that we are sworn to serve. If the change is forced on us from without we will face it manfully, and in faith continue our work on new conditions, but it is no true honesty, and it cannot be true policy to betray the citadel because our forces can be possibly better handled in the field.

But whilst I set aside all other aspects of the case as unimportant by the side of the main point which I have

stated to be, in my eyes, the fact that the attack is an attack upon us as a Church in every characteristic and relation as a branch of the Church Catholic, I think that it may be wise for us to look over for a few minutes the historical features of the portion of our body that is for the moment the object of attack. I will do it shortly. And first, what is Wales and its historical relation to this our own England, State, and nation?

Wales is a district consisting of twelve or thirteen counties, inhabited by people of whom a large proportion is of Celtic origin, with a very distinct language of their own, and with a less distinct, but still distinctive, body of traditions, customs, and ways of looking at things derived from a temperament and experience of their own. The pure Welsh represent a very ancient population which has clung in a very special way to its tribal identity, which comprises probably all the remaining portions of the population which is the earliest historic occupant of the whole of the southern part of this island, driven westward by waves of English conquest. Existing records furnish us with ancient laws of Wales which never were laws of the English; geographical boundaries to some extent follow the demarcations of tribal divisions which were only incidentally modified by English overlordship. Mediæval history is full of the struggles of the Welsh mountaineers against the pressure of English feudality and suzerainty, and the complete and thorough incorporation of Wales with the parliamentary government of this country is a matter of dates and circumstances easily ascertainable. The final accomplishment of the conquest of the Welsh princes, which had begun in the tenth century, comes, as we all know, in the reign of Edward the First, who by the Statute of Wales in 1284 arranged, for the management of the principality, a system which, continuing ancient laws and customs so far as they could be continued, organised a division of counties and districts, and provided a government which was, according to the constitutional ideas of the time, adequate. After an uneasy period of more than two centuries Wales was finally given her share in the Parliament, the twelve counties and the county of

Monmouth being, in 1536, authorised to send members to the House of Commons. The counties themselves had been marked out in the statute of Wales, 12 Edw. I. You may remember, perhaps, that it was not until some five years later that the county Palatine of Chester was represented in that House, and that the county of Durham did not return members until 1675. Since 1536 Wales has been for all purposes incorporated with England: and all constitutional distinctions between the two nationalities, if we may call them so, have ceased to affect political life. I need not attempt more minute details in reference to this side of the question. Careful scrutiny, or indeed superficial view, will detect points of resemblance and points of contrast also, between the relations of Ireland and Scotland with England, before and in their respective unions; and it takes very little scrutiny indeed to recognise certain tenacious characteristics of Wales, which the present political questions connected with Ireland are likely to bring into prominence. That, however, whether we look at it from the point of English statesmanship, or as a part of the nationalistic idea which during the last half-century has thrown other countries into political disorder, I cannot think of dogmatising upon now—we have enough practical work on our hands.

(a) The Welsh Church before the Reformation.

The history of Christianity in Wales goes on very different dates and circumstances from the secular history of the nation, with of course some very obvious and necessary coincidences. The historic Christianity of Wales, the Church in the Welsh-speaking dioceses, is the most ancient portion of the Church of this island of Britain. Whenever and wherever the Gospel was first preached in the island, the standing results and remnants of that preaching are to be found in Wales, both as an early colony of Roman Christianity and as the refuge of the ancient British Christianity in flight from the unconverted Saxons and Angles of the invasion in the fifth century. This Welsh Church thus represents the body to which the Celtic

Christians of Cumbria and South Britain belonged, the church which gave Patrick to Ireland, and a few generations later drew Columba to Scotland, which gave, mediately or immediately, Chad and Aidan to help in the conversion of the conquerors. It has its early history, not, I am afraid very clear or edifying, in the fragments of laws, councils, and hagiologies. It had its conflict with the Roman missionaries under Augustine; it held out for centuries against the recognised Paschal custom, after it had been adopted universally in the West; and coincidentally with the weakness of the Anglo-Saxon kings and the strength of the Celtic spirit, had its struggles with the Archbishops and Bishops of the Mercian and West Saxon kingdoms. But from the beginning, and even in the acutest of these struggles, the uniting force of Christianity was at work. After the adoption of the Paschal custom, which was finally accepted between 768 and 809, Welsh Bishops appear from time to time in the councils of the province of Canterbury. The admitted hegemony of the West Saxon monarchs was reducing the princes to something like the relation of feudality which was maintained by the Norman conqueror; and gradually, long before the formal incorporation of Wales with England, the Churches were one. The bishoprics of Bangor and St. Asaph revived under Norman rule; the eventful struggles of Giraldus Cambrensis took place in the Court of England and under English auspices at Rome; Welsh Bishops attend court and council; were consecrated and made their profession at Canterbury, bringing with them into the one system of established Churchmanship possessions of lands, tithes, canons, customs, and traditions, which they had from an antiquity to which our oldest foundations cannot pretend. From the very beginning of Parliament the Welsh Bishops were barons as well as Bishops in the House of Lords, and the Welsh chapters and clergy sent proctors to the Convocation of Canterbury two centuries and a half before the Welsh counties sent representatives to the English House of Commons.

And all this was done, not by forcible attempts of English kings and prelates to force on the Welsh an English or

Anglo-Roman system : although the metropolitan visit of Archbishop Baldwin in the twelfth century, and the great visitation of Archbishop Peckham in the thirteenth, had the effect of consolidating the hold of England in both Church and State on the princes and people of Wales. It would appear from what remains we have of the period of consolidation that Welshmen for the most part were made Welsh Bishops and that they took their place as founders of churches and promoters of culture much as the English Bishops did on the other side of the marches. The customs of the country did not interfere with the customs of the Catholic Church; and the language of the ritual being still Latin, was perhaps as intelligible on the one side as on the other. I am afraid that Welsh literature languished, but sermons must have been preached in Welsh, and the Myvyrian archæology preserves religious as well as moral maxims. Welsh scholars wrote of course such monumental works as they did write in the universal language of the Middle Ages.

(b) At the Reformation.

At the Reformation, the Welsh Bishops took their share and interest in the work of change equally with the English, and, although in the parliamentary action of 1531-1534 the people were not represented in the House of Commons (a point on which I should suppose the Roman statement rests that Wales never accepted the English Church as Reformed), the names of Welsh clergy are amongst the most prominent actors of the time. One Welsh Bishop was among Parker's consecrators, one was among the Marian martyrs, one is the single case of a Bishop who held fast his see through all the changes, not that we need be proud of any one of them.

(c) Since the Reformation.

The history of Wales since the Reformation has not been a history of rest, of peace, or neglect. But it has been varied with other influences than those generally at work in the other dioceses, or rather perhaps the general current of

religious history has been affected specially by the difficulty of language. There was much poverty: the dissolution of the monasteries which had appropriated the tithes, but had to some extent provided divine service, in that respect grievously impoverished the Church working in Wales; the tithes were not restored, the impropiators had no responsibility. But from the early days of Elizabeth certainly there was nothing like practical neglect. The Bible was translated into Welsh, and under the Act of 1561 the Prayer Book also. To meet the isolation and impoverishment of the clergy schools were founded: Jesus College at Oxford especially, in 1571; a foundation which showed an intention on the part of the Government to try at all events to bring the Welsh-speaking population into full sympathy with the general culture and the religious life of the nation. To a great extent, and for a comparatively long period—that is, down to the Civil War—this went on well. The use of the Welsh Bible and Prayer Book for the first time brought religious truth to the people, and divine service, in a language which they understood. The Protestant side of the Reformation work was welcomed; and although it now suits the Roman Catholic authorities to say that Wales never accepted heartily the Reformed Church of England, all evidence shows that, together with the accepted Reformation teaching, the Welsh maintained distinguished loyalty. Archbishop Laud, who was himself consecrated to a Welsh see, and who visited Wales as Metropolitan, whilst he was not a likely man to shut his eyes to the real weakness of the political position, saw little beyond the poverty and remoteness of the parishes and the consequent fewness and poverty of the clergy, but what might be amended by ordinary care and discipline. Of Roman influences, except the resort to St. Winifred's well, there was no trace: of schismatical activity even now there was but little, and that well under hand. Later events throw light on what was going on under this surface, but the outlook still was not alarming.

Upon this perhaps too easy treatment of a superficial aspect of affairs came, in 1650, after the practical proscrip-

tion of the Church services and preaching, the famous Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales—a measure which bears an ominous resemblance to the extreme scheme of Welsh Disestablishment which is now threatened.

This Act appointed a commission which was empowered to eject all the clergy who were judged guilty of delinquency, scandal, malignancy, or non-residency; and to sequester and appropriate the revenues of all benefices “which now are or hereafter shall be at the disposing of parliament or any other deriving authority from them.” These revenues were to be applied to the maintenance of godly ministers—six, it is said, for each county, who were provided as missionaries to bring the people to the truth as the devisers of the scheme had defined it. The clergy, whether episcopal or intrusive, already impoverished and isolated, were widely ejected, delinquency was a very wide charge, and there was no power of collective resistance. It is needless to say, what is true of all such schemes, that all that in this design had good and useful purpose failed: the itinerant preachers were unsuccessful. But the old influences for good fell to the ground, and the mischief was permanent. With the abuses, which, no doubt, had been great, the uses of Church life and order were set aside.

Nothing that was done at the Restoration could altogether get rid of the results of this legislation. It embittered the relations that followed the Act of Uniformity; and the severity with which that Act was enforced provoked a vindictiveness of reaction. And with the Restoration came in, notwithstanding all attempts at repression, that fuller flow of Nonconformist teaching which, whilst it affected England generally, has affected Wales even more distinctly, being accentuated, as the phrase goes, by the difference of language. Sadly little care was taken during the last century to bring Welsh-speaking Bishops and curates into positions of efficiency. The very attempts made to improve education and general culture by the infusion of sound English influences had the effect of widening the separation

between class and class, Welsh and English. Then came the Methodist revival, appealing to the class that spoke Welsh and needed culture and education most. Still the Methodist influence, which in its Calvinistic form has had so large a share in producing present complications, worked for a long time within the lines of the Established Church itself. There was not, until early in the present century, any distinct theory or practice of non-establishment connected with Welsh Calvinistic Methodism ; it was as ready to work through the machinery of the Church and the clergy as through the agency of a voluntary system. In 1811 this ceased to be the case, and since then, although by no means alone, for Wesleyan and Baptist congregations are also powerful, this denomination has taken the lead as I believe in the movements doctrinal, social, and otherwise, against the order of the Church. I am inclined to think that so far as the theory of Establishment is concerned, the Baptists are the only community that by the nature of their tenets find such a relation as that of Church and State absolutely untenable. Presbyterianism is, of course, incompatible with the episcopal system, and Unitarianism, with the fundamental creeds of the Church, but the doctrinal incompatibility of established institutions with voluntary association, is an idea of growth more modern by far than any of the phases to which I have referred.

Question of Language.

I do not pretend in this review to offer you more than a very scanty outline of the events, an acquaintance with which is absolutely necessary for any understanding of the present question. I have done my best to avoid any interpretation of them that may be construed as political or as affected by mere party bias. No question of Church government and no crisis of Church history can be viewed as altogether free from difficulty. The history of the Church of Wales has, I believe, only the language difficulty to distinguish it from the history of every other, or any other part of the history of the Church of England ; it has

no such difficulty as arises from traditions of oppression or repression, persecution or intolerance of any kind, or of antipathy, incurable or uncured. The tenacious maintenance of a language which, except for very advanced students, must be regarded as lying to a great extent apart from the influences of general culture, and with it from those of historic and definite theology, has the effect of narrowing the area and sharpening the lines that divide religious thought. There may be something in the Celtic genius that is discordant with the Teutonic; some risk of excitableness, some singleness or incapacity in varying the points of view, some shortsightedness and concentration of sympathy on peculiar forms of political and doctrinal causes. But without the distinction of language these influences do not work to any very serious mischief. It is a strange thing that just as Welsh education is improving and the progress of culture becoming a fact of conscious interest, whilst, coincidently and consequently, the work of the Church in Wales is being better done than it ever has been done before, an attempt like the present for the abolition of the historical Church in the principality should be set on foot; an attempt which really does seem to be made on the impulse of adventitious causes, with which religion and culture have, even in the eyes of the aggressors, extremely little to do. I am afraid that I must add, as in very honesty I am bound to do, a solemn protest against the interpretation of history which is promulgated by the advocates of change, and their unscrupulous use of arguments, long ago and absolutely disproved, as to the origin and law of tithe, the tripartite division, and other points, which, whilst as commonplaces of the destructive party generally they have been pressed with tentative modesty, have in the mouths of the advocates of Welsh Disestablishment been put with a virulence of invective and a disregard of argumentative cohesion that is itself suggestive of anything but sincere or spiritual or even rational consistency.

The attack on the Church in Wales is an attack on the Church of England in every one of its aspects, as a catholic, national, historic Church, as a spiritual body, and

as an established institution; and as an agency for any good work, moral, intellectual, social, or political, not to say religious, missionary, and educational. It is to be resisted in faith and by the use of every right means. There is one aspect of the question of which I have said little because it is not put forward very prominently by the Disestablishment party at present, although historically it underlies the development of the movement at every stage from its origin, or origins, onwards. I mean this: that the attack comes from a confederacy of religious communities which have the reason of their being in the conviction, first held by their founders and since maintained by their followers and descendants, that, in the points which led to the separation the teaching of the Church of England was false and her whole system as based on such teaching so corrupt as to be intolerable to their mind and conscience. It is only on such a conviction that the separation is necessary, or, indeed, justifiable. It was the conviction of the older Puritans, as it is of the Roman Catholics. I suppose that it is the conviction of the other communities, although it may be the only conviction in which they are united. With this aspect before me I cannot see how it can be denied that the movement in existence just now is a movement in attack on the doctrinal and spiritual, as well as on the national character of the Church of England.

The Free Churches.

And just once more—look at the more distant result. Suppose the Church disestablished, and her spiritual as well as her national status extinguished—God forbid that I should anticipate that it ever can be—but suppose it: what is to follow? Can any one of the Free Churches, as they call themselves, or all of them together, pretend for a moment to represent the Christianity of England and its people against the tendencies to unbelief and irreligion, secularism and infidelity that are working in this country, as in the whole of Europe, more or less in conjunction with political forces? Not for a moment. They have not the

cohesion for defence which the exigencies of aggression give them. They have a unity of antipathy, none of sympathy ; they have not the organisation of defence or extension. The Church of Rome has ; and, strangely improbable as it may seem to us now, our descendants may live to see the defence of religion in this country devolve on that organised and confederate system of Church polity and policy, which, twenty years ago, one of our statesmen declared would be the residuary legatee of the Church of England.

Education.

A subject which must always occupy an important place in a Bishop's mind, and consequently in his charge, is that of religious education. It is a very serious matter in every form, and as it affects every class of society ; the direct teaching of religion in schools of the different grades, the public schools, the private schools, the elementary schools ; and the continuation of religious study from the time of leaving school, in evening or Sunday schools, reading societies or lectures, under a plan for higher religious education. There are also such questions of administration as school councils and associations ; and there is the problem of the possibility of securing some real religious work and teaching in the rate-aided schools, which, by the unfortunate legislation of 1870, are precluded from the use of doctrinal and other formularies. When I speak of unfortunate legislation of 1870, you will understand me to refer now simply to that restriction, and the way in which the Act of that year allowed the restriction to be worked, to the exclusion of religion from school lessons ; the result being the lowering of the religious teaching of all lessons, and, to some extent, the dispensing with any religious qualification for the office of teachers in rate-aided schools.

I do not think that it is unfair to say that, until the year 1870, we had tried to teach the children of England, as the children of the Church, their position, powers, privileges, and duties as "Children of God, members of Christ, and

inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." I do not say that it was thoroughly well done anywhere, or that in many places it was well done at all, but it was never lost sight of. The teaching of the Church Catechism, which, I believe, when carefully taught, to be an adequate mental equipment for ordinary Christian people, was an integral part of every school curriculum.

In 1870 that was changed: the teaching of the Church Catechism was made unlawful in board schools—the doctrine that we taught was necessary, even necessary to salvation, was treated as unnecessary—direct prohibition was applied to the formula; the omission, which is prohibition, was applied to the substance of the teaching. It is only in the voluntary schools that the Catechism is to be taught; the multiplication of subjects common to the secular schools, and competition, under the inspectoral system of the Education Department, with those schools, tend to put the religious element into a lower place, and this tells again on both teachers and scholars, notwithstanding all that is done in the training colleges and by the clergy in their parish school teaching, to redress the balance, and what is done also in the way of diocesan inspection. And I fear that this benumbing influence works outside schools and affects home teaching; telling also, in that way, on the efficiency of Sunday-school teaching by the encouraging of unqualified helpers. And, indeed, we must not conceal from ourselves that we have by no means come to the end of the struggle for existence. The religious teaching that is still maintained in schools where direct use of formulas is forbidden, is still in the hands of teachers who, in a large proportion, have been religiously trained and cannot be expected to throw off the influence under which they have grown up. That proportion, of course, is continually diminishing as newly trained men and women succeed the old ones. The constant attacks which, one way or another, are made on the Church training colleges, require constant exertion and watchfulness for repelling them; and in the struggle, which may any day become critical, our energies and funds will

be taxed to the utmost. I do not wish to be an alarmist, but we must not shut our eyes to facts or to the new aspect under which, in present circumstances, they are presented to us.

In saying what I am going to say, I do not wish to appear to be trying to instruct men, many of whom have had more experience of the educational work than I have had, certainly in its recent developments. Nor am I going to propound any new expedients or propose any new experiments. I am thankful to see, and to see the fact recognised, that, in all branches of this work, our diocese stands abreast, if not in the very forefront of the educational phalanx, as in the development of higher religious teaching and in the employment of the best machinery for securing it. I am simply putting before you the way in which I think that we must represent to ourselves and realise our duties so that we may effectually guard some of our outposts, answer some criticisms, and nerve our generous helpers—and they are generous helpers—for sustained and increased effort. There are also some very critical matters which must be noted.

When the Duke of Wellington said that he doubted whether the devil himself could devise a worse scheme of social destruction than the secular education which means knowledge without religion, he used stronger language than I should myself have ventured to use; no doubt he had better information. But whether the language he used were too strong or not, he meant something; some part of which we can be pretty sure that he did mean, and that we have experience of its truth. He did not mean that any knowledge was pernicious or worthless in itself; but that all knowledge opens up to men the ways of evil as well as the ways of good, and that, as a rule, the ways of evil are easy and inviting, whilst for the ways of good, involving restraint, industry, and discipline, we and our children, in our weakness, need the guidance of religious teaching and the sanctions of religious motives, prospects, and authority. Is it not so? The very learning to read brings the boy and the girl within the range of bad literature as well as

good, of the mischievous columns of the newspaper as well as of the beneficial or innocent. And that illustration is sufficient : it is true also in every branch of human teaching ; and the liberty so imparted, the latitude so offered, involves a temptation which only the strict inculcation of and training in the way of purity, honesty, truthfulness, and kindness can help us to overcome, which can be overcome by the grace of God, which secular education neglects to teach us how to seek. Well, we are told three things in answer to this ; first, that moral teaching is given in and with secular education ; secondly, that the decrease of crime proves its efficiency ; and, thirdly, that that definite religious teaching which we desire is formalist and sectarian, *i.e.* unfit for children who cannot understand doctrine, and on our part, selfish and sectarian, calculated and worked to secure adherents to the Church of England rather than to moral and properly religious improvement.

I think that we can safely reply to all these three answers : first, it is very good that moral teaching is given with secular education ; we are very glad to learn that it is so, and so far as mere morality based on selfish considerations, or on social considerations, or on old-fashioned moral considerations which have their real basis on the very religious teaching that is proscribed, but which are not yet eliminated from the lessons or the minds or the habits of the teachers, so far as such moral teaching can ensure morality, it would be wrong to undervalue it ; it is well to be thankful for it. But, mind you, the moral and social influences of such teaching, whilst they may suffice to keep the young awake to the impolicy, or the bad taste, or the folly, of vice, or of particular vices, do not in themselves carry the motives or the sanctions of virtue, the fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom, or the consciousness of His relation to His children and members and inheritors of His kingdom. There is a tendency, unquestionably, in such teaching of moral lessons, to teach the folly and inexpediency, and even repulsiveness, of those vulgar sins, intemperance, dishonesty, open vice, which ruin character and prospects, and spoil the com-

placency of an easy conscience ; but there is no true and real supply of the discipline of a pure heart and a loving life, and the desire of the imitation of the Lord, or of walking worthily of the vocation wherewith we are called.

And again, accordingly, if I am told of the decrease of crime, and that that decrease is to be ascribed to the increase of education, I am not called on to dispute the fact, although I do not myself attach supreme importance to statistics. If crime has decreased, surely a fair share of the decrease may be assigned to the continued and improved working of religious education—it is not all claimed for the secular teaching—and certainly no part of the decrease of crime can for a moment, by any possibility, be ascribed to the exclusion of religion from the rate-aided schools, which is the point at issue. I do not dispute the fact, I say, but I would like more proof of it, and of the cogency of it ; certainly there are many other causes for decrease of crime in the modification of laws and in the administration of punishments and reforms. I would to God that I could believe that there is a real decrease in the sort of sins that bring only private punishment, sins against purity and unselfishness, sins which are tolerated as not bringing their punishment presently ; the grosser cases of these are in the papers : there is a literature, too accessible to all who can read, that seems intended to suggest the sins for which the world has no punishment.

But to the third answer, that we teach formally and for sectarian ends, there can be but one reply—one reply to both clauses of it. Children cannot be taught without forms, and the forms by which Churchmen try to teach them are the forms in which they themselves express what they believe necessary for the purpose for which they employ them. Children cannot be taught the substance of any lesson without a form ; the alphabet, the spelling-book, the multiplication table, the first lessons of grammar and arithmetic, are quite as much a formula as the Church Catechism ; the only way of learning at all is through the use of means, the exact rationale of which is not and

cannot be understood until the lesson is learned. We try to teach our children the law of faith, repentance, and obedience, so that when they come to the time when these things shall be consciously the law of their life, they may find that they have some equipment towards the work of their struggle and opportunity; and we confess that we do want them to be taught what we believe to be true, and how to find what we believe to be the true way of eternal life. If that is sectarianism, and if such sectarianism is a drawback on Christian liberty, and on the free development of religious consciousness, so much the worse for those who have made it so. We have not made it sectarian, if it is so: but whether sectarian or not, it is what we want and what we do not mean to forego, if we can help it.

But to leave the general question—upon which I think there cannot be much difference of opinion amongst us, looking at our actual situation at this moment—we have to contend against some discouragements, and those discouragements pressing heavily just now. Even things that in themselves are a benefit, and were intended to be an unmixed benefit, free education, for instance, which was meant to be not only a relief financially all round, but a spur and help to improvement all round, has brought with it an increase of responsibility which at this moment outruns the increase of resources. A sudden and general pressure is put on to complete the machinery and increase the efficiency of schools all at once: all at once things must be done which, distributed over areas and dates, might have been easily done at leisure. I do not quarrel with this; the leisure itself involves slackness of working and loss in the meanwhile of usefulness. But the truth is that we are not prepared for the uniformity of the pressure: and more schools are set in a position of emergency than we are at all able to help. I am most thankful for the means that have been put in my hands for giving such help; and most glad to think of the number of schools which have put themselves in order without coming to my fund for help from it. But still much is wanted,

and there is no finality to be looked for; as the work prospers, more still will be wanted, and we must prepare to find it. Further, we want help to maintain the system of inspection, the original fund which was got together for the purpose being exhausted; the schools must have the inspection, and the friends of the schools must be prepared for some sacrifice to retain it. The association of schools for mutual help and joint action, and the employment of such new machinery as we associate with the name of organising visitor, these matters have been before you for a long time. I cannot press them more now or more effectively than has been done. But I will commend them earnestly to your help where you can give it, and I hope that you will try to spread the knowledge of them amongst those who can help as you cannot. And I must now content myself with the same advice in reference to the several branches of the Higher Religious education movement. This is a plan and purpose which we cannot expect to be at once appreciated in its full importance. Schools, public and private alike, are a little shy about recognising the necessity, and, when a scheme so large and well supported as the University Extension movement complains that it is not treated as well as it deserves, our diocesan attempts may be glad and thankful for, although by no means content with, the progress that they are making. I must add to my confessions that I am very sorry to gather, from the report of the meeting of public schoolmasters at which the question of religious teaching was discussed, that so little clear insight was shown as to the needs of the class to which they minister, or the ways in which those needs can be met. It is not my intention, however, to make any remarks on the speeches made at the meeting I refer to, only a very cursory report of which has as yet reached me. It is very possible, indeed most probable, that a mere fragment of the debate was put on record, and that the views assigned to the speakers represent only a very small part of the discussion. In such brief reports the points which catch the attention of the casual reporter are very often the

exceptions rather than the rule of the principles discussed in detail. But as to the general result, I must say that we do not want an invertebrate morality, which is only morality at all when it is in sight; or an undogmatic divinity which is dogmatic enough in exclusion, and has very little divinity or any other sort of efficacy in its formal and perfunctory inculcation. My own experience of such work in our public schools is not at all in accordance with such experiments, and I believe that a strong and manly and healthy tone in such schools is co-extensive with the sound discipline and sound doctrine which I trust will always be the rule at Eton, Wellington, Bradfield, Radley, and the other Church schools with which it is my privilege and comfort—and you can scarcely conceive what a comfort a Confirmation in such schools is to me—my privilege and comfort to deal.

I have spoken at length about the principles of our action, and shortly only about the ways of working them: but I trust not in vain either way. The importance of the matter cannot be overstated—the difficulties can be overcome, but there are critical points, and there are new grounds of anxieties on which, perhaps, now it is as well not to touch, lest I should risk a suggestion of discouragement.

I must not, however, omit to mention the plans which have been mooted lately for some approach to be made to a reconciliation of the religious school system with that of the board schools. In the London School Board, Mr. Athelstan Riley's proposition for a revision of religious teaching has been met by a counter-scheme which can really be described only as a scheme for the endowment of Unitarian teaching, and which is probably only a move for the entire defeat of the attempt to introduce doctrinal instruction. With this we have to do only as interested spectators. The Bishop of Salisbury's Bill for the introduction of a sort of conscience clause machinery for the inclusion, not the exclusion, of specific religious instruction into board schools, is well worthy of support. It is so unlikely, however, that any important measure for edu-

cation should make much progress just now, that we can scarcely do more than welcome it as an indication that the expedients for reconciliation need not be entirely given up. That our people should be rated in support of a teaching which, to their minds, is so corrupted by the lack of the salt of religion as to be practically falsified, does certainly seem unfair in the last degree. But certain fallacies that are just now dominant, and certain difficulties which men have neither faith nor energy to strive against, block the way, which foolish concession and division of uninformed opinion, twenty-three years ago, made narrow enough. I wish, indeed, that we were likely to get anything like true liberty of teaching in the schools for which we have to pay so dearly.

However, the Churchmen of England are now well awake to the importance of the matter. Manchester, which has always stood well to the front in educational work, is organising a scheme which must, if it does nothing else, open the eyes of thinking men to the injustice of the present state of things. Doubtless there are very strongly conflicting opinions as to the possibility of securing aid from the rates for voluntary schools; as to the expediency of claiming it; as to the possibility of securing local control in conjunction with steady working. There are influences, moreover, in every region of society that would make men satisfied with the present state of things if only they could persuade themselves that the present state of things could last. And there are the doctrinaire influences which have done more mischief in this department of social work than they have done in any other: the doctrinaire influences that hurry on change for change's sake, and that dwell on single principles without allowing for the counter-working and combining power of other principles; that never weary of trying new experiments without considering for a moment the qualifications of those who are to put them to the trial, or the fate of those on whom they are to be tried.

It almost seems as if with certain schools of thinkers the souls of the children were a sort of material on which

practices might be tried as vivisection is sometimes said to be tried on inferior animals, for the mere purpose of deciding curious questions, or making experiments for the sake of finding out ways of improvement. What wonder if they perish in the empirical handling! It is not so that we, with all our weakness and narrowness, have tried to use them or to treat them. I return to the point I put first. It is as God's children, as England's children, as our own, that we want to have them taught; to make the most of every gift, to seek to be well equipped for every sort of real human happiness, to be guided along the ways on which we know that we have been safely guided in a progress which can be no true progress when it is broken off from the Way of Life. The path of the next generation may be, nay, surely will be, very different from that in which we have walked—there will be even greater temptations, as there will be grander opportunities, and must be corresponding responsibilities. We cannot bear their burden or fight their battle, but we will do our best in faith and prayer to keep up their strength and to train them for the battle, which, in the long run, is the same battle as our own.

Clerical Poverty.

When I look round this diocese and see the number of livings with almost nominal incomes, I am astonished to think of the number of clergymen there are who spend their private fortunes in the service of the Church. I suppose that, as a diocese which has long had effective Bishops and some local advantages—and I wish indeed that I was as effective as the local advantages are—the diocese of Oxford has been especially favoured with such men. Everywhere I see parsonage-houses built and churches restored, the cost of which I know has been chiefly borne by the incumbents present or past within a few years. Everywhere I see schools that have been and are largely maintained at the expense of the clergy, who as clergy are receiving incomes curiously inadequate. For this I am most thankful: but I think that the laity should

be more appreciative of the fact; and I would lose no opportunity of telling them so.

Still there is a great deal of poverty. How about a sustentation fund, an eleemosynary fund for clerical relief? I confess that I do not see my way to this as a hopeful solution or even as a temporary expedient. Things agricultural may, perhaps, now be as much depressed as they are ever likely to be short of entire extinction and failure: but he is a very sanguine man, and he must be very much younger than I am, who can persuade himself that within measurable distance of prospect they are likely to be very much better: and very much better they must be before tithe and glebe, even if safe, can be regarded as adequate to meet the old exigencies. No, we must face a depression that cannot be met by temporary relief. Still, such a fund might do something. I question whether it would do more than is done already when and where appeal is made in the right place and for the right case. Here I am sure the laity are awake, sympathetic and helpful. I am aware, as you doubtless are, of a proposal that the better endowed clergy, the Bishops, chapters, and richer incumbents, should tax themselves a voluntary three per cent. on their incomes for a general fund. There is in this an appearance of something practical—but it is an appearance that will be disappointing. There are many Bishops to whom I am sure the composition of three or even thirty per cent. for the expenditure in diocesan work of benevolence would be a welcome relief—no—not a welcome relief, for surely there is some pleasure in being a cheerful giver—I will say a sensible relief. But a man always gives with much more care and with more of such enjoyment as the personal interest carries with it, in the cases that he knows, than in cases which are left to a general committee. As a matter of fact, as I think that I said in the last charge, every penny with which a Bishop taxes himself for a general cause is subtracted from his means of meeting diocesan calls. However, that is not the only difficulty. Deans and chapters as well as Bishops can calculate their means and tax themselves equably, but the clergy of parishes differing

infinitely in their populations and in every other particular that involves outlay, cannot possibly rate themselves in any such way. I do not know half a dozen livings in the diocese in which I could advise an incumbent to promise to tax himself three per cent. in perpetuity for a common fund. I know that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he gives very much more, very much more and gladly : but I do not like, and I do not like to recommend, any man to tie his own hands or his liberty to tie or untie his purse strings. We will do what we can to help one another. I will only now recommend to your careful consideration the Convocation reports on this most important matter.

Clerical Economy.

Now about insurance and pensions. In this line matters have, I think, become clearer than they were in 1890. The diocesan committee of the Clergy Pensions Institution has formulated the terms on which the younger clergy may be encouraged to a little foresight, in a circular which is, I imagine, within reach of you all. And those who are honestly convinced that it is possible for them to be growing older, may find in the same circular suggestions for a proceeding by which forlorn poverty after the time of work is over may be avoided. We have some such cases in this diocese now ; and they are such as well-disposed laymen could well deal with, to the great relief of parishes which are suffering because no help can be got for men too old for work. I would strongly recommend to the laymen to subscribe to the augmentation section of the Pension fund, and to the younger clergy who can, to insure whilst they can : I will use the language of a letter written to me by a clergyman of the diocese who has devoted much attention to this matter and, at a cost of trouble and expense to himself, has done much good service. He says, "I recommend at the age of 23 buy a minimum pension of £15 15s. returnable in case of death. That will cost £2 2s. per annum. If better off, buy three times £15 15s., *i.e.* £47 5s., for £6 6s. per annum. This with the augmenta-

tion hoped for will make a respectable pension at 65. Then, instead of an ordinary insurance, take out an endowment policy for £500 payable at 65 or at death if it occur previously. The premium for this at the age of 25 in the Clergy Mutual is £11 17s. 6d. At 65, by the operation of bonus, the £500 will probably have become £850. If it is wished (I do not think it desirable), this would purchase approximately an immediate Government pension of £85 per annum. If the younger clergy would do this grievous cases of poverty would not occur. Inefficiency in parochial work from poverty would come to an end." I confess that I think a great deal of this advice is practical, and that it is all good: the excise on the whole might suffer if 2s. a week spent on tobacco could be diverted to the Clergy Pensions Institution, but most other interests would be benefited. However, I am against coercion, and do not force my advice in the direction of one particular economy, much as I should like to do so.

Union of Benefices.

Turning from this extremely personal application, I must say one or two words about the possibility of using the power, which exists in the trustworthy hands of the Archbishops, to allow by dispensation the union of small and adjacent benefices in plurality, at all events until some provision is made for augmentation, or possibly for permanent union. This expedient for meeting, at all events, some present pressure has been tried in three or four cases within the last three years in this diocese. I need not specify the cases. There is something to be said for and against: against it is the parochial feeling; the parishioners even of a small parish miss the services of their own peculiar parson, and do not like constant changes of curates. They miss the family influence, too, of the central house in the village and all that means in the way of that sympathy, society, and culture. For it may be alleged great and necessary economy. A parish may well be too large for one man, and not large enough to give occupation to two; in such cases the annexation of a neighbouring

village is a positive gain to the administrative efficiency of both ; if the curate cannot occupy the second parsonage, it may be let, and the rent will be a contribution towards his stipend ; the whole system of the two parishes will be eased. It is, however, very obvious that such arrangement can only be made satisfactory where both benefices are in the same patronage ; and possibly the only cases in which it can be entirely satisfactory are those in which new districts have been prematurely cut off from the older parishes, in which case it would seem easy to recur to the old arrangement. I do not recommend this in any case ; it is better not to contemplate the reduction of the number of working clergy from any point ; but it may save a good deal of waste in these trying times, and it will certainly suggest to many who can afford to help, the absolute necessity of increasing the small endowments. It is only in very exceptional cases, of permanent diminution of population and the proved uselessness of existing machinery, that I should recommend permanent annexation by order in Council, although as a matter of economy it may seem expedient in other cases. I must add, I think, that except where the churches and villages are very close together, I should not recommend the reduction of services in either ; guarding, however, against the temptation to deal with one of them by obtaining mere Sunday help. The clergyman who comes down from London for the Sunday and is absent all the week gains no real beneficial hold on the people, nor they upon him : he simply displaces the parish priest and gives nothing real to supply the place. Often, too, we have to come in contact with occasional clerical helps who are anything but helps, far more snares. About these I have to administer a caution, or repeat the strong warning which I gave in 1890.

Clergy Discipline.

The list of legislative measures concerning the clergy which have been before the Parliament since 1890, to which I need at all invite your attention, is a very short one. The state of public business has not been such as to allow

any great opportunity of considering either attack or defence, reform or extension of usefulness in this relation. How long this is likely to last it is impossible at this moment to say ; the determination of the critical conjuncture in which we now find ourselves can scarcely be long delayed : but so many anticipations in recent affairs have been disappointed that we can only say that an attitude of cautious vigilance must be kept up. For the time the agitation about the marriage laws seems to be suspended. The Act of 1891, on the recovery of tithe rent-charge, is beginning to be in efficacious working : the tithe rent-charge is now payable, as a rule, by the owners of the lands from which it arises, and it is to be recovered in the County Court. These are the points in the Act which, familiar as they must be to all owners of tithe rent-charge, require no comment from me. The remaining clauses contain points on which I should strongly advise the clergy, as indeed I have done already, to move only with good legal advice. The Act was certainly meant as a boon to both landowner and tithe rent-charge owner. It requires a supplementary Act to encourage fair redemption. For that we must wait until, at least, easier times. There are objections in sentiment as well as interest to some part of this legislation. But the real break between the tithe proper and the tithe rent-charge took place when the commutations were completed ; and no one could now think of recurring to the ancient state of things which the commutation, with all its drawbacks, was wisely intended to abolish.

The Act of 1892, 55 & 56 Victoria, c. 32, the Clergy Discipline Act, is one of great importance. At present our practical acquaintance with it is concerned rather with the history of the difficulty with which it got through Committee in the House of Commons, and the somewhat fanciful misgivings with which it was received when Convocation was asked to make a canon which should harmonise the Church law with this Act. Of the opposition in the House of Commons, as it is almost impossible to speak in measured language, I should prefer to say as little as possible ; if there ever was a course taken by a

party, or a section of a party, which carried its own condemnation on the face of it, that was the case then and there ; and it was, moreover, a course and a policy that justifies the most suspicious interpretation of every proposal on religious or educational matters that proceeds from the same source. After that proceeding we cannot give the party that adopted it credit for anything but an exterminating purpose in all measures affecting the Church that emanate from it.

As to the misgivings about the form of the canon, I confess that I did not and do not share them : neither the form nor the proceedings for the passing of it are really open to much criticism. Certainly, as I believe, both the authority of the Church and the spiritual position and function of the Bishop in his relation to the administration and execution of the Act have been adequately provided for. Of course, the Act is not exactly all that an ideal Church legislator might have wished for ; but in all probability it is much better. I hope that it will be a very long time before in this diocese any action need be taken under any of the clauses of it. The cases in which it has been applied in some of the neighbouring dioceses show that it may be worked with that economy of cost and scandal that it was intended to insure. It is as well that the clergy who may be called upon to act as assessors under it should know so much of its general principles and rules as will save them from difficulty when a case arises ; but there are more minute points in it than I can advert to now, and we must hope that the difficulties will be diminished by the very rarity of the occasions on which conflicting opinions of interpretations may arise.

The Free Education Act of 1891 concerns a different branch of our interests and anxieties, with which I am dealing elsewhere.

Church Patronage.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has a Bill now before the House of Lords on Church Patronage. This Bill embodies most of the recommendations which during the last few

years have been approved by the wisest advisers of Churchmen in this matter. It provides for the abolition of auction sales and mortgages, of the sale of next presentations, and hurried sale of advowsons ; it affords distinct securities in relation to presentations and institutions, with a view to prevent anything of the nature of simony or evasion of the law respecting it, and to stop the institution of persons on the representation by the parishioners of their unfitness ; it strengthens the Bishop's hands in dealing with appointments of men unfitted by age for parochial efficiency, and makes rules that are very much needed for the proceedings in case of the Bishop's refusal to institute, and the consequent appeal against such refusal. Donatives are to be turned into presentative benefices, bankruptcy and incurable indebtedness are made legal reasons for the voiding of livings, as well as proved incapacity for doing duty ; and bonds of resignation are abolished. Security is also increased in the matter of privilege in relation to testimonials and references. Some of these provisions will, of course, be opposed by persons interested in the sale of benefices, and, no doubt, arguments will be forthcoming to prevent the summary dealings with the rights, as they are called, of property, based on ancient custom or legal decision. I do not think, however, that any one of the abuses struck at in the Bill can really claim anything more from either law or custom than that it has had tolerance in a weak state of public conscience and inadequate apprehension of the nature of the trusts and duties involved in patronage. It may be asked, How can the clergy promote the passing of such an Act ? The answer is, By calling the attention of their representatives to the details of it, and to the evils which it is intended to cure. You will find that such efforts are needed in the case of every attempt at legislation that lies outside the range of party politics. Just now party politics seem to claim every question as having some political characteristic, and I suppose every question has ; but, unluckily for reform of abuses, this inclosing of all questions has the effect of staying useful action in most things, and especially in Church matters.

Whether this comprehensiveness of political programmes will or will not preclude the discussion or advancement of such Bills as those of the Bishop of Salisbury, on religious education, and of the Bishop of Chester, on the licensing laws, I am not able to say. There is, however, a Bill before the House of Commons now which does seem to have some chance of becoming law during our lifetime ; and which will incidentally affect our country districts a good deal : I mean the Bill for creating Parish Councils.

Parish Councils.

This Bill is intended to complete the symmetrical arrangement which was installed five or six years ago in the Local Government reforms that instituted County Councils. It is, of course, quite impossible to say in what form the Parish Councils will become a settled part of the national system of local self-government ; for although both sides of the House of Commons are willing to have something of the sort, both agree to it with so many anticipations of improvements in committee that he would be a very rash man who would undertake to calculate on the result ; *amphora coepit institui : currente rota, cur urceus exit ?* As at present advised, we understand that Church matters are excluded from the purview of the Bill. Against the principle of it I think little or nothing can be said : within the proper lines that property and authority involve, it is very reasonable that our village people should manage their own concerns. The difficulty of the legislation will lie in the determination of those lines. I do not think that if the plan is to be left to the free handling of those who will work it, any results will follow that are likely to be hazardous. Of course, if the working of it falls into the hands of local or professional agitators, it will be otherwise. Anyhow, it is, on the face of it, a return to ancient custom, and if it does embody some modern ideas which are a little discordant, the proof of it will be in the working. As far as the position of the clergyman in the new constitution is concerned, he will in each case have to earn his status as a villager and village councillor. He does not get much of

his own way now : when he stands on personal rather than official merits he may get more. And the parish charities will continue to demand his watchful care even if his educational and spiritual work is untouched. My counsel to the clergy in this matter is, if the Bill becomes law, accept the position sincerely and do not stand aloof from the working of it. If you have a true hold on your people, as their minister and God's, you will not find it shaken by the mere novelty of power in the use of which, such as it is, they will need guidance. Do not be fastidious, and do not think of abstention. If you have not such true hold upon them already, here will be a new opening of opportunities to gain it. It will do you no harm if you have to learn to be better men of business. I speak foolishly, but there is some truth in the thought that prompts my counsel.

Divine Service.

I propose to make some few remarks on the conduct of divine service, and on the smaller points connected with clerical work which in the earlier portions of this charge I have been obliged to pass over, in order to give more attention to the matters of primary importance on which I have offered you words of counsel.

Daily Service.

One thing that I wish you to think over at leisure is the duty that the Prayer Book lays upon all priests and deacons, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause, to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, and on all curates, *i.e.* persons in charge of parishes, to say the same in church. This rubric is one which I can neither dispense from nor enforce. With many of the clergy in country parishes it is impossible to collect any such number of their parishioners as could be called a congregation; "reasonable hindrance" is an expression susceptible of wide interpretation; the old custom of daily prayer in church has only been revived within the last fifty years in country places, and there are in the service itself

matters of detail, familiar to all of us who have tried to use it so, that involve little difficulties. To some of these, if not all, the Act of 1872, 35 & 36 Vict. c. 35, supplied a remedy. The shortened service appended in the schedule to that Act is one about the daily use of which in public or in private there can be no difficulty. And it takes away all excuse based on the idea of reasonable hindrance. This I leave for your consideration.

Special Services.

The use of special services is a point on which I would be clearer. It is important to remember that the Act of 1872 does not authorise special or additional services, except under two or three conditions; one of these is that these services shall be approved by the ordinary. It is not in your discretion to invent or rearrange services, even if every word in those services is taken from the Bible or Prayer Book. There is some risk, especially in what are called Mission services, of this proviso being overlooked, and the consent of the ordinary being taken for granted. I must point out that, unless this direction is observed, it becomes impossible for the ordinary to protect the clergy who presume too much on his consent.

The second proviso, that in all additional and special services only the language of the Bible and Prayer Book is to be used, is, I believe, generally known and acted upon. But it has been suggested and supported by speeches in Convocation that the words of the Act are capable of wider application, and that under the authority of the diocesan the ordinary collects and prayers may be used, the exact words of which are not taken from the sources prescribed, but in which the matter, or motive, or gist, or whatever the proper expression may be, is found in Holy Scripture or the Prayer Book. Such an interpretation would allow the introduction into occasional services of some of the very beautiful collects of both Eastern and Western Christendom, which we miss in our own Prayer Book, and it would also give an opening for the use of special services for which the words of our Prayer Book certainly furnish no appro-

priate or particular expressions. There have been for some years Committees of both Convocations engaged in drafting special and occasional services, which might some day or other receive sufficient authorisation. The work has been slow, and perhaps slow to advantage; we may have had some lucky escapes in the matter. But it is proceeding, and by the time it is finished we shall be in a condition to ask for the authority under which the use of the forms will be sanctioned. In the meantime I will counsel my clergy not to be too liberal in their interpretation of the liberty that this Act of 1872 gives them, but to apply to the ordinary for the consent which it is his to give when it is necessary. It is not nice for me to go to a restored church, or even a harvest festival, and to have a form of service put in my hands, drawn up and printed without any sanction from me, which I must use nevertheless or risk throwing the whole congregation into disorder.

Preaching.

About preaching I will say only two or three words. I wish that I could be sure that my younger brethren are avoiding the really very obvious pitfalls which lie in the way of all who have to preach many sermons. Is there not a danger of that appearance of unreality that risks the making of preaching repulsive to the hearers? Unreality is itself a harsh and large word. I do not suspect it in the men whom I ordain and send. But it is the appearance of unreality that is the more common danger; the study of that *ὑπόκρισις* which to the Greek mind meant appropriate action, but by the English mind is translated into its direct Anglicised form of hypocrisy.

Is it unnecessary for me to warn you of the suspicion of unreality that is aroused by the use of mannerisms—mannerisms that are, moreover, not your own? Of course I know that not every curate, every parish priest, and certainly not every Bishop, is a born orator, or even a natural orator: and that it is a matter of necessity, and not merely of education, that we should have models of delivery as well as of style for our discourses. I can remember a time

when every man who cultivated his gift of preaching was an echo, distant indeed, of Bishop Wilberforce; there are clergymen now whose utterance and intonation remind one of Liddon, not to speak of other men living and effective, thank God, in their own work. Of course there are many who in form of thought and expression have a distinct and natural affinity to their models, for human nature, even as exemplified in clergymen, has a limited number of types. But there is a snare in this—and there is nothing more fatal to the acceptableness of a clergyman than the idea that he is imitating someone—imitating even the best of men, in certain intonations, certain spasmodic apostrophes, certain expressions of address, certain commonplaces on which the greatest orators are from time to time obliged to fall back. However unimpressive your own natural style may be, it is more impressive to the hearer than an unreal one, however carefully acquired. A mere mannerism is very much easier learned than a complete style of utterance and action; and singular and peculiar expressions which may be quite at home in the sermon of an established preacher are ridiculously out of place in that of a beginner, however sincere may be his intention and firm his hold on the truth he is telling. And there is one illustration of this, which, although I may be giving pain to some of you, I cannot honestly abstain from giving here. I mean this: the way which many of the younger clergy are getting into of using the name of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, over and over again, in excited paragraphs, in humdrum repetitions, in almost profane connexion, without any honourable prefix or affix, or even any respectful intonation. If you would only count how many places in the whole of our Prayer Book the name of Jesus Christ is mentioned without any ascription of the kind, you would find, I think, that in an average careless sermon it is so used infinitely more often. This I am bound to say jars upon me in the best sermon. It used to do so in sermons of the greatest preacher I have known; with him it was perhaps quite natural; copied from him it is a mannerism and a repulsive one. Well, one must live and learn.

Another thing : certain great scholars and theologians are busy working at the higher criticism of the Old Testament, and at the reconciliation of our Lord's method of appeal to it with the truth of His divine omniscience. It is not by any means necessary that either one or both of these subjects should be constantly ventilated in sermons on the elementary truths of the Gospel, or that every young clergyman should, in speaking to his people, be expected to make a general saving clause in favour of accepted verities, that might be touched by such and such conclusions from these critical studies, or in demonstration of the fact that he holds himself in suspense upon them. In nine cases out of ten the reference is unintelligible, in the tenth case it is suggestive only of misgiving. And, after all, no such expression of opinion is at all looked for from a preacher who is not supposed to have given special study to the subject.

Just one thing more on this : very dogmatic and categorical startling statements on matters which would not require startling treatment, if they required any, are out of place in the sermons of young men, or old either. The nature of angels, the occupations of heaven, the exact relation of the lost to the saved, the relation between the Church and those who disown belief in her, the character of everlasting punishment—all of them subjects which we have no certain revelation to make clear to us—are always difficult subjects for treatment in addresses to mixed congregations ; and yet they are matters of most positive and disproportionately elaborate dogmatism. I once heard a well-known preacher on everlasting punishment scream out at the top of his voice that the doctrine was a cornerstone of the Christian faith. He had undertaken to preach on an infinite mystery, and, in the excitement which the need of a written sermon would have saved him, gave utterance to a statement as ill-proportioned as it was repulsive. I hope that I shall never hear another like it. But equally sweeping assertions, and apparent claims to omniscience, are not very uncommon when a narrow learning and inexperienced handling and want of propor-

tion in belief and of preparation in utterance come in contact with a zeal that is not according to self-knowledge.

The only other caution I will offer now is, do not try to be startling by overstatement or incongruous treatment of holy things. There are sorts of rhetoric which are pardonable on the platform, but unpardonable in the House of God. The play upon words, the strain after humourous expression, the excess of epigrammatic incision, are out of place there. There are absurdities of exaggeration, too, that move only to ridicule. The glorious music of a very humble country choir; the magnificent adjuncts of a few additional candles; the noble architecture of a restored church; the splendid eloquence of the local popular preacher—why should you speak of such things as things enhancing the honour due to Almighty God, the mystery of the sacraments, the reverence of His sanctuary? Surely it is the altar that sanctifieth the gift. Well, perhaps I am grumbling too much: but I mean well. I do not like to hear remarks which I cannot help hearing, after confirmations even, much more after special services, that seem to vulgarise, if it can be done, our humble and hearty offering of such things as we have, by putting upon them a burden of meaning such as they really cannot bear. But this is more than enough about mere manner. For the matter of preaching, read, read, read; think, think, think; pray, pray, pray; write, write, write; until your heart interprets God's heart to the heart of your people.

Reading.

You will not, I am sure, think that I am wishing to go beyond my line, if I offer a few words of counsel, words which, in the very nature of the case, must be more applicable to the younger than to the older clergy, on the subject of reading—the books that it is well to read and to avoid. We live in days of a great many books, and of so much work as does not allow to many of us much time for reading, and certainly with not much margin for buying. Young curates complain, no doubt with some reason, that

they have little time for study ; the old clergymen, like myself, rather congratulate themselves that in past years they had some spare time for it, inasmuch as they have not now. Still, in the main, I believe a great deal of reading is done, and some writing, and both the reading and the writing is a little miscellaneous. There is much temptation to desultory reading, and there are hours of weariness, during which the reading, to be possible at all, must be comparatively light. And I take it the clergy, with all drawbacks, read more and more widely than any other class of men in England. And the greatest scholar whom I know, the man who is, I believe, the greatest scholar in the United Kingdom, is the greatest reader of miscellaneous reading.

The mass of miscellaneous reading within reach of moderate means at the present day is enormous. Hence my wish to offer a little caution. If you must read fiction, and I, for one, see no harm in seeking some rest and relaxation in that direction, let it be sound fiction. There is plenty that is sound, good literature, and improving art. There is much that is unsound, sensational only, and verging on the unclean ; the very names of the writers carry their credentials. Close the book as soon as the suggestion of evil comes, and take care that other people do not get hold of it. There is no real knowledge of human life, or of even current opinion, to be got from reading that sort of story.

Then there are so many reviews — reviews, didactic articles, symposiums of real writers and imaginary conversations of unreal ones. I cannot say do not read these things, because you will if you can get hold of them, and they are in many cases signed by authors who have a right to speak, and whose mature opinions must have weight. But do not think that you can, by reading such papers, furnish yourselves with the real knowledge on which alone you can frame real and independent views, much more opinions or conjectures. A vast number of such papers are merely kites thrown into the wind for the purpose of seeing what way new views may be blown. A great

many are trial pieces, the very tone and matter of which shows that the writers are trying to formulate their own views; others are *ex parte* articles, the complementary parts of which must be sought in the answers which really makes this department of literature the athletic sport rather than the schools and lecture room of the university of public reading. And there is a further mischief in reading opinions of clever men, which are in the very nature of things immature. I put this sort of reading next to fiction; not that I recommend it more; there is often even less reality about it, and perhaps fewer people bind up their reviews than do their approved novels. Read them if you like, but do not think that you learn from them.

The caution to be administered in reference to more recondite reading is more serious. There are many books in men's hands just now, edifying and profitable to those who have had the training to understand them, and judge of the good and evil that is in them, but by no means fit to be taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly. And here let me remark how unmitigatedly painful it is to me sometimes to hear, and to hear of, sermons preached by young men who have read the advanced book without having worked out at all the elements of the philosophy or history upon which its conclusions are framed. It is so in history, it is so in political science, it is so in theological reading, as well as in the criticism of texts and the analysis of physical forces and phenomena. The reader who begins at the beginning has, as soon as he begins, won half his way to the conclusion. The reader who begins with the conclusions is storing up for himself a happy reserve of repentance and some disciplinary lessons which will have a real value as the conviction of his own ignorance is forced upon him.

Do let me press upon you that standard books must be read before young men are even beginning to be in a position to judge of the value of new and startling utterances. There are far too many theological books written just now, of which the guiding idea seems to be,

that in order to be forcible you must be startling. We have views on the sacraments strongly marked by this characteristic ; views on Reformation history, views on the development of the religion of the future, and what not. You may take from me, as one of the results of a life of much study of one sort or another, the warning that there is no real power in paradox, and that where a book bases its claims on startling revelations, its conclusions are apt to be either very old or very false.

Still, there are abundant stores of good new books as well as silly ones: I wish that my younger clergy would read the safe ones first. Real knowledge, real fruitful knowledge can only be acquired by learning one's way through such discipline ; do not let the element of novelty, even if the novelty be one of the widest general interest, and the resistance to its temptation regarded as a mark of backwardness and obscurantism—do not let the novelty of new theory or the promising vistas of developing research beguile you away from the real stores and fountains of knowledge. My words have a wide application, as you will realise if you will take the trouble to think them over.

However, now I am not prescribing a course of study, only cautioning you how you should read for rest and refreshment.

Writing to Newspapers.

I wish now to say a word upon a delicate subject on which I am well aware that there are strong differences of opinion among strong Churchmen, and about which, from past experience, I fear that I shall have every chance of being misunderstood. I want to caution the clergy against engaging in controversial correspondence in the newspapers. I have very great respect for the fourth estate: I am well aware of the service that is done by the newspapers to the cause of order, morality, and public honesty. Personally I have never had serious occasion to quarrel with their treatment of me, my words, acts, or books, although I have not been spared criticism. But

neither the fourth estate nor the general public to which it appeals is a tribunal that has authority in controversies of matters of faith: and there are a great many matters of faith, and of things closely connected with faith, which require very different handling from the ordinary matters of political and social interest which it is the proper function of journalists to discuss, which they are trained to discuss in proper methods, and which they are accustomed, I might say engaged, to discuss from particular standing-ground and in particular attitudes. We may grant that the sound logician and the effective rhetorician can apply his art to many and most varied subject-matters, and yet we may object to his applying them to regions, not merely subjects, but regions of thought and spiritual questions which in themselves are subjects for neither logic nor rhetoric. The treatment of great spiritual questions, and indeed of ecclesiastical questions, in the leading articles of some of our best papers, religious or secular—for I will draw no invidious distinctions—is not such as a man penetrated with a sense of the sanctity of spiritual things and of the difficulty of disengaging them from ecclesiastical things can either approve or sanction. The weekly religious paper is a weekly religious trial which it takes long experience to enable me at least to bear religiously. The evil, however, against which I would caution you is not this, but the controversial correspondence that suggests the editorial, and that goes on week after week, every challenge having to wait a week for a reply, and the reply another week for a rejoinder—a state of things which is very unfavourable to the exercise of patience and very hazardous in relation to charity.

Now why should a clergyman who comes across a difficulty fling down into the arena of vulgar animosities the most sacred things in the whole universe? Why should a clergyman, in order to liberate his own soul, write a letter that provokes a reply in a spirit that makes thousands of those whom he ought to love and honour, sad, whom the Lord has not made sad? If he is attacked, as we all are sometimes, why should he reply? The King's command-

ment is, "Answer him not." Why should we think it necessary, when we find ourselves differing from our neighbours on, say, such a matter as the Suspensory Bill about the Church in Wales, to speak our mind, when really no one asks us to speak our mind, when our position is not such as to make it all a matter of duty to speak our mind, when our information on the subject we write on is such as can scarcely warrant us in assuming that we have a mind to speak, and when, in fine, we at once hurt and discourage our friends and give occasion to the adversary to blaspheme? If you are called on imperatively to speak, say what you believe and what you know; you will then speak with a sense of responsibility which, in nine cases out of ten, will lead you to reconsider everything that you have to say, or else will punish you very effectively in the reconsideration of what you have said.

Personal and party recriminations are matters about which I should be sorry to think that you should think that I think such caution necessary. It is not these that I refer to. It is the wretched self-consciousness that must assert itself; the temptation to vanity and obstinacy that are the direct result of such straining for publicity.

And I cannot exempt from censure any, however sincere and modest, who incautiously throw down into newspaper controversy sacred things even with the sincere belief that true and good results may come out of the discussion. In the best cases, more evil than good results invariably come. Bad passions are stimulated, false principles are ventilated, the Church of God is wounded, and the world laughs, and is justified in derision.

If you want real questions answered, ask people who can answer them; do not suggest to people who know less than you do that they can answer what you cannot. There are wise and willing men amongst you. For the sake of truth and charity take care that our good things be not evil spoken of. I have already, through the rural deans, tried to put a warning before you to this effect; it is not unnecessary. I desire to urge it most strongly now. The scoffers may be pardoned as not knowing what they do,

but woe to the man by whom the offence cometh, whether his motive be impatience, or idle curiosity, or party spirit, or mere vanity, ay, or the most sincere belief that it is his duty to sacrifice peace and charity to the liberation of a soul that no one has the slightest desire to fetter.

THIRD VISITATION CHARGE

MAY AND JUNE, 1896

WHEN the great Bishop Butler, in his primary charge to the clergy of Durham in 1751, felt himself obliged to begin with a lamentation over the general decay of religion in this nation, he no doubt had in his eye, not only the increasing influence of professed and ostentatious worldliness, but the working of the pretentious philosophy of his own day. Fifteen years before he had said plainly that it was being taken for granted that the falsehood of the Christian religion was an agreed point among all people of discernment. His experience had since shown that the profession of unbelief was by no means incompatible with zeal: "Zeal, it is natural to ask, for what? Why, truly *for* nothing but *against* everything that is good and sacred amongst us." The form of our trial is in these days not the same, or the same to the same extent: although the working of the hostility has results not greatly varying from the evils that Butler had to deal with; and the meekness of wisdom, with which he advises that they should be met, is still the safest, readiest, and most effective weapon in the hands of the faithful. It is not, indeed, now true that among people of discernment the falsehood of the Christian religion can be said to be an agreed point: and I trust that it has ceased to be at all true, that, to any such extent as Butler thought, there is an active zeal prevalent amongst us against everything good and sacred. But it is true that there are regions of society in which such zeal is active, and in which that zeal takes the form of controversial virulence, the painful characteristics of

which cannot be exaggerated. The spirit which leads to the circulation of infidel tracts, and that in the most irritating way—such as the sending attacks on the Incarnation, or on the Resurrection, at Christmas or at Easter, so as to poison the happiness of a joyful celebration—and that for several years it has been my trial to endure—such a spirit is indeed one that betrays its own motive too surely to be misunderstood. And when we, whom these things only reach occasionally, are told that writings of the same sort are constantly sent about in towns and villages, carefully to be kept out of sight of the parson, that the leaven may work without contradiction, we cannot but confess the existence of zeal against the most sacred of all sacred things. It is possibly true that the poison brings its own antidote—sometimes it may; the outrageous tone of blasphemy must shock those who have any remnant of affection or respect for the truths that they have learned: but it is not a sufficient antidote when it falls into the hands of those who, having education enough to make them think it a fine thing to question and doubt, have neither teaching enough, nor interest sufficiently real, to make them follow up the doubts and questions to a solution, or to realise the practical consequences that acquiescence in the sceptical attitude eventually brings. I do not propose to speak more of this phenomenon. It has to be looked at in connection with the whole argument for religious education, and religious education is the only way in which the evil can be met and counteracted. Controversy, if, indeed, it is ever of practical use, except in the way of stimulating research, is altogether useless in dealing with the class of mind, and the standard of logical appreciation, which is most affected by the mischiefs that I have referred to. The meekness of wisdom in this respect prescribes Hezekiah's commandment, "Answer him not"; where he must be answered, let it be done in meekness and fear, as St. Peter tells us; the true preservative is sound teaching which will forewarn and forearm; affirmative, not polemical; to edification, not merely to demolition.

Unity.

One of the most important and interesting questions that have been before us during the last few months for discussion, whether practical or theoretical, has been that on the possibility of recovering, for the Church universal, that unity of corporate consciousness, the spiritual and visible union of all who profess and call themselves Christians, which we humbly believe to be one object of the great prayer of the Saviour on the night before He was betrayed: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they also may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Of course you will understand that I refer to the letter of Pope Leo XIII. to the people of England, on the subject of reunion, and also to the schemes which are, from the quarter of religious Nonconformity, annually put before us in the agitation which is represented in the Grindelwald Conferences. I would give all credit for honest goodwill to the motives which have produced these proposals. I am thankful to recognise, in the way in which they have been received in the Church and in the country, the existence and growth of a spiritual desire for the consummation of our Lord's desire.

The great prayer of the Saviour, then;—this word Unity, is very much before men's *hearts* just now. It has been before their *minds* from the very first. It is one of the most all-important words that, in the hour of His agony, His devotion of Himself as the Mediator, the Saviour God, offering Himself by the Eternal Spirit to God the Father, spoke with reference to His people. And it has been before the Church from the beginning, when the Church in all its plantings was taught that it was one in God's husbandry, and God's building: one, "even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee": one, as there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, one body and one spirit, and one hope of our calling; and so in the Creed, as a matter of faith, one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church.

But the experience of the faithful has been an experience of sore trial. And, from the very beginning, there have been questions as to what this word of the Lord should mean, the how, the when, and the where those that believed on Him through the apostles' word should be one; and how and when and where they should realise it. And, in the experience of fightings without, and fears within, holy men, with a true wish to believe and to act on the duty that belief involves, have very often fallen into two divisions of thought; one attenuating the idea of Unity until it means hardly anything, and may safely be left out of the calculations of practical Christianity; and others restricting it in such ways as to exclude from it the greater part of the nations and communities which must have an equal share with them in the consummation of the divine purpose, but which alike, it may be, have in their turn excluded and included in the same way. And between these there lies, as it seems to me, a variety of theories, hopes, aspirations, and definitions, through which only the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to be earnestly prayed and watched for, can be expected or hoped to lead us; it may well be by long and slow and separate steps. And we are tempted, now perhaps especially, although I doubt not the cry of the people has been from the first like that of the saints for judgment, "How long shall it be till they shall know that the Father hath sent Thee?" "Where is the promise of the coming?" "Are we not wrong in our anticipation, or interpretation: how, when, and where have we been, are we, are we going to be, One, as Thou and the Father art One?"

Any such utterance of our Lord Jesus must carry the force of a prayer, a promise, a prophecy, and a command: a prayer that cannot fail, a promise that cannot be broken, a prophecy that will come true, a command that the faithful will, at all events, try, as far as they can understand it, or enter into the purpose of it, to obey and further to fulfilment.

As a prayer: with desire He desires it; the Son Almighty speaks to the Father Almighty; it cannot fail; it is a part

of the very purpose of the Incarnation, "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." *As a promise*, it comes to all hearts that are right with His heart: they shall share the Unity that He prayed for, and that they desire in sympathy with His prayer. But *as a prophecy*, how, when, and where is the fulfilling? *As a commandment*, how, when, and where is the possibility of obedience? So the practical as well as the doctrinal sides of the matter set themselves.

Who is sufficient even to try to answer? How in the past, in the present, in the future? How in that transcendent contemplation of the Most High, before which all time, all eternity, is one, and things that are not as though they were, into which transcendent contemplation how is the Spirit, or is He at all, trying to guide us? Lord, we believe. The Saviour's prayer, see you, is for all who shall believe: what sort of a Unity have all they realised who have in the past believed on Him, through the Word? Or, if we think that their realisation is still a thing of the future, within what conditions of knowledge and law and system and life can we claim for ourselves a share in that future of their fruition? Is it not true that we desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and do not, so far as we conceive, see it? A day when, on authority that none can dispute, the moral instinct in man shall receive one consistent answer to all its queries in the perfect enunciation of law; when the desire of knowledge shall be met by a recourse to an oracle of universal acceptance without the risk of doubt; when divisions of heart and mind shall, as soon as they are realised, be reconciled by the manifestation in its integrity of that which, from diverse angles, we see only in part? We desire to see a day when all law and all knowledge shall be seen to be one, and men who have sought truth from different sides shall see that all that they have sought in loyalty is one Truth, and all that they have loved in sincerity is the fulfilment of one Law. We desire it, and Unity in it; we do not refuse to believe because we do not get it; our Saviour has warned us that there will be days when, however much we desire it, we shall not have

it; and we learn from that warning that such Unity is not the Unity for which He prayed, if His prayer is to be understood as asking for Unity at all times and ways, for all who believe. The Church whilst it had the bodily presence of the Lord, did not realise anything like that. Nor even in the first ages did the Unity of Truth and Faith show itself so to all or to any believers. The creeds had to be brought to form, not by successive revelations, but by successive logical arguments; and not even in the Athanasian Creed, which embodies in the most logical form the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, has the Church ever pretended to embody so perfect a counsel of God as would satisfy all who desire to know about the things that are most to be loved and lived for.

And following up this train of thought, do we not see that, in the very nature of things, without reiterated revelations, there must be liberty given to the human mind to expatiate and differentiate; else knowledge would be confined to a very limited area, and the enunciation of definite truth, as the exclusion of indefinite inquiry, would prohibit growth in the knowledge, and repel the efforts of those who desire to know. Where countless men, even proceeding from the same groundwork of fact, devote themselves to the expansion of truths as they see them, there are countless openings for such diversifications of doctrine, as the revelation of supreme Truth alone can bring into harmony, and the manifestation of supreme Unity alone could reconcile into a oneness and uniformity of utterance. Do we ask for such a uniformity of utterance? Does any Church in the world expect it? Is any Church in the world justified in claiming the possession of that oracle which shall answer all questions, and solve all doubts, and satisfy all aspirations? Such Unity has not been in the past, such Unity is not in the growing and changeful present; such Unity will be when that which is perfect is come. What command lies upon us, by the fulfilment of which we shall justify our claim to share it when it does come?

Meanwhile, do we not see reasons why this consummation does not come in the ways in which, *primâ facie*, we

might look for it? If we had to define its outward manifestation, we should doubtless require, as indispensable portions of it, the oneness of the Articles of Faith, the cohesion and solidarity of administration, corporate unity in order and government. We do not see it. Whatever may be the other characteristics of the Unity, and again I say it may be that insensibly we are growing and living by them, these characteristics we do not see; we do not see corporate unity of doctrine and discipline; and the world has never seen it from the beginning; there are no signs in the times that they ever will see it thus; and, in fact, the laws of the development and differentiation of knowledge, in which doctrine subsists, and of liberty, in which order subsists, seem themselves to forbid such a realising of Unity without a special interposition of divine power. Well, we do not see as He sees; things are, doubtless, nearer than they seem to us, whose vision is bounded by the horizon and the surface; the fact remains, we do not see this much of the Unity that we should see, to realise fully the Lord's words.

It is not without reason, surely, that that solemn word, "that which is in part shall be done away," comes to us in the midst of the psalm of Charity, in the pursuance of which we can all surely do our little to the preparation of the Gospel of Peace.

Do you, then, perhaps you will say to me, make the Unity for which the Saviour prayed an intellectual uniformity of knowledge, or belief assuming to be knowledge, or of appreciation of the Truth as at each stage it reveals itself: do you identify it with the Unity of faith and order, which assuredly is not as yet or likely; if you do so, are you not practically denying the possibility of a Unity in the Body of the Church, and with it ignoring the article of the Creed as well as the teaching of the apostles? Surely the unity of intellectual appreciation or of external order is not all that the word means!

Certainly not; I am doing the very contrary, trying to realise what the Unity can mean, has meant, does mean, will mean to the children of the Bridechamber, whilst as

yet that revelation of the Bridegroom in all His glory has to be waited for. . . .

The Church Catholic, as the body of the Lord, growing into the fulness of the measure of the stature, is growing into that condition in which its Unity will be completed, and in its Unity much, it may well be, be comprehended, in which now we see little that looks like it. What, think you, is our duty in that regard in which we construe our Lord's Prayer for Unity as a command binding upon us? Well, *first*, if the realised Unity is to be the entrance on the height and depth and length and breadth of that which passeth knowledge, it is the entrance on something more, not on something less, than we know now. And all our teaching and studying of doctrine, on the rules that divine wisdom in the Scriptures and honest reason in the reader and hearer work upon, is in a way a reaching forward to that ideal. That which we have received is that on which our claim to share the Unity depends, and the basis from which our progress towards it is to start. As time goes on, new teachings will be set aside for still newer, and a better proportion of doctrine will, we must pray, gradually prepare the way for the Unity; but the very law of our spiritual being forbids the surrender of any convictions which we have reached under the guidance of the Spirit whom we believe to be guiding us, merely to minimise the points that divide us, merely with the object of making a show of superficial unity of belief, or, rather, of what I have called the Unity of appreciation of truth as the accessible completion or full growth of what we believe. . . .

We cannot accept invitations to exhibit Unity by casting away beliefs that are an integral part of the deposit on which we are trying to build ourselves up in the Lord, and whose history and development at all events is an integral part of that training by which we have been brought, so far as we have been brought, in the way of realising the growing truth. From the one side and from the other comes the cry, "Lo, here is Christ, or lo, there." From the one side the invitation, cast away the discipline,

in which you have learned of Him as you have learned, and take up an ancient, imperious, authoritative assumption that the whole Unity of past, present, and future is in the rock of St. Peter as it claims to be, forgetting that St. Peter's rock was Christ and not less ours than theirs. We cannot follow. And on another side, come and we will build a tower that shall reach up to heaven, only cast away the dogmatic chains in which you have been trained, declare yourselves free from creeds and articles, and we shall present to the world a Unity that shall convince the world; a Unity, Heaven help us, which, without one real conviction of its own, can carry confusion only worse confounded, wherever it works. We cannot follow.

But can we not pray? Yes, indeed, pray, Thy kingdom come indeed, but in Thine own way and in Thine own time, for Thou art very patient, and ledest on those who will be led in ways that are not theirs but Thine. Even so, Lord, for so it seemeth good in Thy sight.

Is this, think you, a cold, unsympathetic, unreasonable conclusion? Why may we not join in prayer when we are asked? It is the Saviour's prayer, the divine purpose which is, as we believe, to be the fulfilment of the divine prayer. Pray with that consciousness, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; Thy kingdom come. But can you join with those whose very idea is so opposed to yours as to the result to be achieved by the prayer? Can you invoke the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, can you sink the differences, can you enter into the spirit of those who offer you no sympathy but on their own terms, terms opposed to the whole tenour of the history through which you have been taught to pray? How can I join with those to whom Unity and the Church that is to be at one, the body of Christ, nay Christ Himself, are altogether different elements of belief from what they are to me? Yet, may it not be that I am doing the very thing that I am protesting against when it is being done by them?—laying down rules and definitions before the time, and formulating schemes or principles of unity for which I

have no more authority than they for theirs. If it be so, I am indeed only illustrating my own thesis, and supplying those who are listening to me with one more argument against hurry, one more argument for patient waiting, and for putting the prayer that we all yearn to offer, simply, faithfully, with the evidence of things not seen, before Him, to offer for us in His own way; for a consummation to be achieved by obedient following of His guiding as He has given it us. . . .

Meanwhile, have we one single moment's doubt of what will be found in the heart and affections of His people when the Unity comes? We know that it must involve peace, and goodwill, and loving sympathy for all good work, adoring love of Him whom we shall know so much more, and of those whom He shall give us to love eternally. And somewhat of this we may find already, in the putting away of evil thoughts and suspicions, and jealousies, and hard sayings, and bitter words—in the putting away of the claim to have already monopoly of the truth, and the attitude of assumption of infallible judgment. Surely we may, whilst faithfully holding fast the faith that we have received, as we have received it and experienced the blessing, turn away from the attempts to harmonise discordant views and contrarious interpretations of those who have learned otherwise; as well as from the tempting policy of imitating rites and ceremonies framed on lines and models so different from our own. It is one thing to hold our own, quite another to condemn all that is not our own. It may be well that until we can realise the law of Charity more perfectly the fulfilment of Faith and Hope must be delayed; until we keep the commandment better we must wait for the fulfilment of the prayer, the satisfaction of the desire. To him that hath this much shall more be given; more strength of faith, more patience under trial, more comfort of hope, more realisation of oneness in Him in whom all who believe are to be one in the day of His appearing and coming. We may have this much of the Unity realised in us and to us now. God grant us it and lead us on to more.

Rome and Anglican Orders.

I had intended to close here my remarks upon the question of the Unity, without more special reference to the incidents which have suggested them. But I cannot well pass over the discussions which are, I believe, now taking place in Rome on the subject of our Orders, or the way in which that discussion is being regarded amongst ourselves. When the question so discussed is described as being the validity of our Orders, it is well that we should ask what is meant by validity. If it means that the point is being tried whether our ministerial acts, done in the faith of the Church and in sincere and humble trust in the grace of God, are invalid because our Orders have been conveyed and received in ways which the Church of Rome has not used, or has disused, or has even condemned, then I protest most strongly against the use of such words. It is not for any man on earth, or any Church, or unity of Churches, to pronounce invalid what is said in loyalty to the Lord Almighty, or to think of shutting His ears to any of the prayers of any man, Church, or nation, that calls upon Him. But if it means simply that the question is whether our mission as Bishops, priests, and deacons has or has not been warranted in such ways as would justify the Church of Rome in accepting us as Bishops, priests, and deacons, and letting us as such discharge our office in her services, and in that inter-communion in which such recognition is necessary—then it is a fair question for her to ask; and all we need say is that we shall not be bound by her answer, or by the grounds on which she may base it. We have not submitted it to her, nor do we regard her as qualified to speak for the Church universal.

But I most earnestly trust that Englishmen will not be led either to underrate or to overrate the importance of the inquiry. It is not a pleasant thing to think of people declaring that the matter is one about which Englishmen do not care. We do take our stand, so far as our mission and position in the Church Catholic and in the national Church are concerned, on the fact that our Master sent

them that sent us, that we have a mission, a succession, and a solemn historical title to our Orders. It is not well that our people should be told that it is but a little matter, or that we should acquiesce in their acceptance of the charge, that we are impostors, or that they should not and need not care whether or no we be so. But that they should accept any such condemnation as it threatened by a tribunal that can only entertain the question at all, within limits and conditions such as exist here, is out of all question to people who believe as we do. Beyond those limits and conditions it is an absurdity as well as a profanation for the Roman Church or any other Church to determine, or to pretend to a right to determine, whether He in whom we have believed accepts our ordinations, hears our prayers, is present in our sacraments, or turns away from the cry of His people who call upon Him. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Divorce.

I am anxious to put before you briefly some considerations on the questions of marriage and divorce. These seem to me to be called for at this moment in consequence of a discussion which was carried on in the newspapers during a great part of last year, and which arose, partly from the premature issue of a report of a committee of the Convocation of York, and partly from some incidents of a rather disorderly character which took place in a church in London in consequence of the issue of a licence for the marriage of a divorced person. I am not going to review the report of the committee, or define the authority on which it was put forth, much less to comment on the case of the London marriage and its circumstances. But as my own action on the subject, in both the dioceses which have been under my charge, has been freely, wantonly, and unwarrantably discussed, without even the civility of communication with me personally, you will probably think that I am justified in what I am doing now.

I will begin by saying that my own personal belief is that marriage is not soluble in any sense in which the

parties who have contracted it are justified in marrying again whilst either survives ; that the marriage tie may be broken by adultery, but that divorce, which may rightly legalise separation, ought not to legalise remarriage. And this I personally believe to be a principle or rule applicable to both parties in the contract ; and I draw no difference, so far as this is concerned, between the innocent and the guilty in the matter on which the divorce results.

I state the matter thus as my private and personal belief, on which, if the law left me free to act, and counter-acting opinions did not disable me from acting on my own judgment, I should, so far as I can estimate possible conditions for my action, most probably act.

I need not add, perhaps, that I hold the law of marriage not only as a religious, a divine institution, but as the basis of civil society in the matters of the relations of family life, and of public and private morality, independent of the religious sanction which I place first.

These considerations of personal and private belief have to be limited by two serious conditions—first, the fact that other men, whom I believe to be far better qualified than I am to judge, hold contrary opinions ; and, secondly, that I do not find the principles I have stated, either distinctly formulated or consistently carried into execution in any enunciation or enforcement of law, civil or ecclesiastical, so completely as to allow me to put them as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth ; the one unmistakable, unexceptionable, unreversible rule. Some great authorities regard marriage as entirely broken by the act of adultery, and would allow either party to marry again ; others regard it as indeed entirely broken, but would disqualify the adulterer from remarriage, allowing it to the other party ; some would give the Church's benediction to the one and not to the other, regarding the guilty one as disqualified, even after sincere repentance, for any such rehabilitation. I state these as limitations of skilled and pious opinion. I may disagree with them, but so long as I know them to be held, and the men by whom they are held, I must recognise the fact that my opinion is not

uncontrovertible, and that, were I to force it into act, irrespective of other considerations, I should do so at my peril.

(a) Law of the Land.

And, secondly, the law of the land does not at the present day recognise the principle of insolubility; it allows remarriage to either party. It gives the clergy certain limited protection in dealing with the matter, but it does not incapacitate the divorced persons from making new contracts, which are safe as regards all contingent questions, either of validity for family rights and properties, or for legal recognition of moral character and position. A divorced person remarries, his children are legitimate, and he cannot be safely treated as a helpless subject for scandal or libel.

But at once it is said it is not the law of the land, but the law of the Church that is the most important question here, the question that presses most heavily on those who are called upon to act either against their conscience or against the opinion of society. Appeal is made against the operation of secular law, to the law of the Church.

(b) Law of the Church.

I am not going to define or to refine now what is the meaning of the expression *the law of the Church*, or to attempt to distinguish the essence of the law of other Churches than our own. If one Church, if any Church, enunciates the principle of insolubility, and evacuates that principle by dispensations and annulments, it can hardly be said to have such a law as can be regarded as a safe guide in troubled questions. I will not ignore, but I will not approach the action of what is known as Canon Law on this point. Laws which allow the legalisation of infraction so commonly as has been practised by one art or another in every country where the Corpus Juris Canonici is or has been authoritative, cannot be appealed to with any confidence here.

The mind of our own Church may safely be gathered

from the canons of 1603, which guided the action of the ecclesiastical courts, until the calamitous legislation of 1857 inflicted on English society and English morals the most cruel blow that any conjunction of unrighteous influences could possibly have contrived. I need not read the canons 105-107; they, as you remember, contemplating the "separation *a mensa et thoro*," and "annulling of pretended matrimony" as the only causes of the kind, strictly forbid remarriage under the first head, and forbid also the sentence of separation to be pronounced until security is given that that prohibition shall not be broken. In the case of nullity, for obvious reasons, no such prohibition could be laid down; there was no marriage to maintain as of any legal or spiritual validity. And for remarriage after separation *a mensa et thoro*, an Act of Parliament was required to overrule the rule of the Church. It is useless now to debate whether the execution of the law was always up to the ideal of it, here any more than on the Continent. It is a thing so far of the past. It is true that the *Reformatio Legum* allowed the remarriage of the innocent party after a divorce for adultery, but that curious compilation by singular providence never became the law either of the Church or of the land; although the principle involved probably ruled the action of Parliament in passing bills of divorce.

That whole department so provided for in the canons has, since 1857, been taken out of the scope of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and the canons can now only be quoted as an historical evidence that the law whilst it was ecclesiastically administered agreed in full with the spirit of the liturgy, and the solemn sanctions so carefully set forth in the service of Celebration of Holy Matrimony: in the proper contemplation of the Church marriage is marriage "until death us do part."

It by no means, however, follows that, because the judicial and executive administration on the subject has been otherwise provided for, there is not a considerable area of religious, moral, and social questions still affected by the great principle of the spiritual law. No man can

contend, for instance, that the Queen should be compelled to receive a divorced adulteress at a Drawing-room; or that the divorced adulterer should be regarded as a fit person to be entrusted with a position of influence which might involve his action on matters in which moral character or moral judgment was concerned. The law of the Church remains the law of the Church, and active in its right of operation, where it is not fettered or limited by the law of the land; overridden, but not repealed. It must be within such restriction that our freedom of debate has to be exercised.

This is scarcely the place or time to illustrate the point with historical references; we know the words of St. Dunstan, when he refused to withdraw an excommunication against an illicit marriage, which the Pope had legalised. "Know," he said to the legate, "that I am not to be moved even by the threat of capital punishment *plexione capitis*, from the authority of my Lord." We all know the part that the question of divorce had in the struggles of the Reformation; and in the times between Dunstan and Cranmer. The legislation of 1857 revealed, to most Englishmen, a new world of iniquity and temptation, of which in a half-hearted way they pretend to be ashamed; for the disgrace is not in the publication, but in the fact, of the details of the business of the court which deals with this most terrible curse. However, the law is the law, and they love to have it so.

(c) Lambeth Resolutions.

Setting aside, however, reminiscences and speculations, I will now read you the four resolutions agreed on in the Committee of Bishops, of which I was myself chairman, in the Lambeth Conference of 1888, on the subject of divorce, three of which were accepted by the whole Conference, and which were, if anything like canonical opinion can be regarded as authoritative, to my mind entitled to the same sort of respect; these were:—

1. They therefore consider it important to declare that,

inasmuch as our Lord's words expressly forbid divorce, except in the case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

2. They would add that under no circumstances ought the guilty party in a case of divorce for fornication or adultery to be regarded, during the lifetime of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.

3. They recognise the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery; and they recommend that the clergy should not be instructed to refuse the sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who under civil sanction are thus married.

The fourth resolution, which was not adopted by the Conference, was this: 4. But whereas doubt has been entertained whether our Lord meant to permit such marriage to the innocent party, the Committee are unwilling to suggest any precise instructions in this matter, and recommend that where the laws of the land will permit, the judgment should be left to the judgment of the Bishop of the diocese, whether the clergy would be justified in refraining from pronouncing the blessing of the Church on such unions.—It is easy to see that such a recommendation could not have well been accepted by the whole body of the Bishops as a resolution of the Conference.

These were the resolutions of a committee of men of exceptional learning and very large experience, from England, India, the Colonies, and America; and were approved without controversy by the Conference.

In applying the principles which are embodied in these resolutions to the practical cases which may come before us, I must, I think, point out two considerations (I have referred to them before), which must be allowed very im-

portant weight. First, we must not treat our own conclusions as being the law or as superseding it ; the ideal of the law may be far below our own ideal on the subject, but what we have to act upon is the law of this Church and Realm. We cannot wisely act on our own opinions as if they were law, or outside of the legal sanctions with respect to which we are bound to act. Secondly, we must recognise the moral as well as the legal authority of the secular law in its own area ; we cannot deny that in such points as concern the legitimacy of children, or the rights of property of married women, to mention none other, and the law of libel, the law of the land has a moral as well as a properly coercive authority.

(d) Issue of Marriage Licences.

Now I will say a word first about my own action in regard to licences, which was brought into question last year.

When in 1884 the question was put to me as Bishop of Chester, whether I would allow licences to issue for the marriage of divorced persons, my answer was a direction that no such licences were to be allowed : the issue had been forbidden by Bishop Jacobson, my predecessor ; his direction I confirmed, and that course was, I believe, observed, and is so still.

No such question was put before me when I came to this diocese ; and matters went on as they had done under my two wise predecessors : the issue of licences of the kind being forbidden. I was consequently much surprised when, having done nothing in the matter, I was called on to answer for having adopted a new policy in my new diocese. On inquiry I found that there was no new policy, and that neither I myself nor the practice and rule had changed. We were acting on the rule which Bishop Wilberforce had on very good advice laid down in 1857, which was reissued in the Instructions to surrogates in 1894, that no licence should be granted for marriage to any person who has obtained a decree for the dissolution of marriage under the provisions of the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 85, if the husband or

wife, as the case may be, of such divorced person be still alive. That is the rule which, so far as depends on me, I have without change of mind or purpose regarded and maintained as the rule of the diocese. The whole speculation as to my relapse, reformation, and reconversion was in the imagination of the people who wrote to the papers.

So the matter stands, as regard the issue of marriage licences in the diocese, so far as it is in my power to deal with them.

I will now remind you summarily of the state of the law with respect to the marriages of divorced persons, and add such cautions and counsels as occur to me in reference to them : in respect to such points as admit latitude of choice and treatment.

You are aware that persons divorced, whether innocent or guilty, are in the eye of the English law capable of re-marriage ; they have a common-law right to demand the publication of banns ; they may produce licences, the parish priest may not refuse to publish the banns if the parties are rightly described ; he may refuse to celebrate the marriage ; he cannot refuse the use of the church if the parties can find a clergyman, who is entitled to officiate in the diocese, to celebrate. A Bill allowing the parish priest to refuse the use of the church for such marriages has had a satisfactory reception in the House of Lords. I have received memorials from some deaneries in the diocese in favour of this Bill, and I have no doubt that further steps will be taken to insure its passing into law. I am not aware that any legal decision has determined what qualification is required for the clergyman who celebrates a marriage which the parish priest has refused to celebrate ; that is, whether the term "entitled to officiate in the diocese" has been held to include one who may not have distinct authority or permission of the Bishop so to officiate.

(c) Registry Office.

In these circumstances the most simple and natural solution of the practical question is that the parties interested should secure their legal position by marriage at

the office of the Superintendent Registrar; this is not uncommonly done. This proceeding secures the legal status of the couple so united. It is an unfortunate circumstance that the mismanagement of law or practice in regard of such marriages should give them a clandestine and, to a certain degree, a rather disreputable appearance; but they are valid marriages, although the blessing of Almighty God, according to the rules of the Churches throughout Christendom, is not implored for them, nor any proper benediction given. The further question is, to what extent may the recognition of the Church, as distinct from that of the law, be given to them. I have not heard of any case in which divorced persons, after civil marriage, have in this diocese applied for celebration of holy matrimony in church. Such celebration would not be contrary to the law of the land, as laid down in Sec. 12 of 19 & 20 Vict. c. 119. Should it arise as a practical question, I should be guided by the first and second resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, in any case in which I should be asked to advise the clergy.

(f) The Innocent Party.

But I would dwell for a moment longer on the third of the resolutions, which recommends that the clergy should not be instructed to refuse the sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who under civil sanction are so married—*i.e.* persons who, having been innocent parties in a divorce, have remarried at the Registry or elsewhere. Of course it is one thing not to instruct the clergy to refuse, and another to instruct the clergy not to refuse. I confess that at the present moment, after very careful study of authorities, and in very sincere humility as to my own capacity for judgment, I am inclined to advise the clergy not to be too rigorous in this matter. To put one case specially. A man, innocent party in a divorce case, marries an innocent woman; the marriage is legal, it conveys no idea or suspicion of immoral relations. Can the woman be reasonably regarded as excluded from the privilege of Communion which she seeks as a means of grace?—for I must exclude the consideration of cases in

which people attempt to use their admission to the Sacrament as a sort of quasi-rehabilitation. I confess that I think it hard if she is so excluded; I cannot instruct the clergy to do so. And neither shall I instruct them to refuse Communion to the innocent man who has after divorce so married. I think that, as St. Paul says in another case, he is wiser if he so abide; but I do not share the idea that we should repel him as a notorious sinner, which, after all said and done, he is not.

And lastly, seeing that the right and duty of the clergy to repel unfit persons from Holy Communion is a right and duty beset with canonical and legal difficulties, I would earnestly deprecate any rash or arbitrary action in such and in all such questions. I would warn you in dealing with them not to mistake your own historical or spiritual conclusions for the law, spiritual or secular, of this realm and Church; and not to be led into a labyrinth of casuistic possibilities by invitations into the Canon Law of other ages, countries, Churches, and conditions. It is a divided responsibility that in these matters lies upon the parish priest; some of it lies on the conscience of the would-be communicant. It is better to suffer a hundred cases of unworthiness than to drive away a single penitent, or a single earnest candidate seeking strength and grace. I speak as advising, not as directing, here.

In conclusion, I must deprecate rash utterances and impulsive action; it is to the last degree, and is sure to be construed as, a sacrifice of principle to self-will. I know, and you know, that there is an evil influence at work in society, which only awaits its opportunity of still further relaxing the law of marriage, getting rid of religious safeguards, and making that which should be the trustworthy basis of social relations a mere temporary contract that may be broken or dissolved by mutual consent. Depend upon it, sensational proceedings and ill-considered enunciations or general allegations, which have very little effect for good, lay us open to attacks which it may be very difficult to repel. The parish priest must remember that, whilst he is bound to consider all circumstances which

may affect his own conscience or his duty to his people, he is not a judge of the law, much less a judge beyond reach of appeal; and that he had better not constitute himself an arbiter in the cases with which his conscience and duty are not concerned. Of course I mean only cases in which questions may reasonably be regarded as debateable. Principle is never endangered by consistent prudence; and where principle is real and strong there is no risk in equitable suspension of the exercise of judgment.

Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.

I must not leave the question of the Marriage Law without some reference to the continuous pertinacious attempts to withdraw, by legislative action, the union of a man with his deceased wife's sister from the list of prohibited marriages. It is a painful thing to have year after year the Bill for authorising this measure carried through the House of Commons, to be rejected with very varying majorities in the House of Lords. And it is one of those struggles which by their very weariness betray us into defeat or compromise. And it is an irritating struggle also, because of the continuous misrepresentation of the reasons for opposition. We are told so constantly that the opposition of the Bishops is a mere act of self-opinionated and arbitrary obstinacy: it is never even for a moment allowed as possible that we should have a conviction that the change would be a wrong act, contrary to the whole spirit of scriptural argument and analogy, contrary to the tradition of the Church, contrary to public policy in its highest regard to social morals. It is not considered either that with the present temptation offered by facility of divorce, the integrity of nine-tenths of the households of the country might be put in peril. It may be said that I am assuming too low a level of common morality. It would be well if I were exaggerating, but the pressure on both these points is very strong, and neither class feeling, nor family feeling, nor even religious conviction, seems to protect us. The area of divorce seems extending; the relaxation of the prohibition of these marriages to be urged

more vehemently than ever. I can say nothing new about this. I will not suggest compromise. If the thing is to be done, it must involve an extension of the system of civil marriage, which is indeed a small part of the evil ; it must involve the reconstruction of domestic relations of the closest character ; and it means a store of ecclesiastical difficulties that I shudder to contemplate. As a minor matter, I must protest distinctly against the cogency of arguments derived from the practice of Churches and countries in which the sanctity of marriage is of less account than it is in England. The arguments are far-fetched, and singularly unreal in the mouths of men who, to their credit be it said, would be the last to admit the relevance of the analogy in other matters.

Church Reform.

At the time of the Visitation of 1893 we were, as you will well remember, anxiously preparing to meet the attack on the Church of England threatened by the proposed measure for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales. Consequently a large section of my charge was occupied with advice and caution on the subject of Church defence, chiefly, however, from the point of securing right and true information on the methods of defence, and the realising of what it was that we have to defend. Now that particular cloud has passed away—would that we could say entirely and for ever ; and, so far as the special measure of attack is concerned, there is a cessation of agitation. We owe a great debt of gratitude to those who have helped in the work of defence, and who have succeeded in putting before the nation the true issues that were involved in the struggle. For the moment there is a lull in the strife, and it is one to which we have to take good heed ; for, depend upon it, the agency which was at work against us in 1893 is at work as actively as ever in other forms and specialisation of aims. It is not reconciled to a repulse, it will not hesitate to take advantage of any opportunity, it will not allow us for a moment to neglect defence ; nay, its apparent quiescence should be putting us on our guard

all round, lest the next attack should be directed to some point at which we are still more open to it. We have to maintain and extend our defences.

For the present the situation seems to be this: there is a favourite watchword, "Church Defence is Church Reform." It is a brief and comprehensive formula; unfortunately, like all other such watchwords, it has a double edge, and it is not wise to accept it as a basis of alliance without a distinct understanding of what "Reform" means. The word is an awkward one, for it may quite as easily be interpreted to mean the pulling in pieces of the whole fabric of the Church of England to be reconstructed on principles altogether new, as it can be interpreted to mean the getting rid of recognised abuses and the bringing into their proper relations of the portions of the fabric which the recognised abuses are disguising or disgracing.

The cry of Church Reform means a good many things between these two extremes of the scale: between the demand for such measures on patronage and discipline as have been proposed and embodied in proposals of legislation by the Archbishops and their advisers; between the confused and confusing schemes for ecclesiastical unity which have been formulated by the two furthest apart sections of religious people within and without our communion; between the theories of ideal reorganisation that are ventilated by constitutional specialists; between the practical immobility of those who would contend that even if in the Church whatever is is not right, it is still so out of repair and ill-balanced that it cannot be touched with a hope of securing any great improvement; and the speculative adventuresomeness of others who maintain that whatever is is wrong, that any change must be for the better, or if not, that there is nothing worth saving.

Sharp words come from all these quarters; sharp words of attack and sharp words of reply. And the Bishops, I think, get a good many of them from friends, candid and critical, and foes who borrow their weapons from the candid and critical friends, as well as prove their genius for attack by the invention of new artillery. From even one and the

same quarter come curious and inconsistent reproaches—reproaches with which we have to reconcile ourselves as proofs that we are suffering in the way that from the beginning Bishops have a right to expect. We are solemnly warned of our several and special delinquences ; of our neglect of the discipline which we ought to bring to bear against one another ; of our attempts to enforce discipline where we can and have done it ; of our party proceedings and our want of corporate zeal ; of the rashness of our utterances and the impossibility of getting us to speak out ; of our subserviency to lawyers and newspapers ; of our fatal slumbers and our helpless perplexity. And we are as constantly urged, even implored, to exercise powers which we have not, by the very people who are as constantly blocking the exercise of the powers we have. Then, again, we are to put our house in order ; to substitute democratic for autocratic polity ; to equalise all endowments ; to fill all posts of trust by elective processes ; to reconstruct Convocation ; to protect the interests of curates ; to leave untouched the rights of patrons, and devolve the choice of clergy on the parishioners. But there is no limit to the number of our counsellors, and we are tempted, as has been said, to think that our safety is largely secured by it. But it is all very serious matter, and it is no adequate answer to say that it always has been so, and probably always will be ; and that it is of no use to murmur against bitter words.

In point of fact there is much to do, and we are not idle ; I speak from experience when I say that a man who becomes a Bishop gives up everything else to enable himself to give himself to the work that God sets him ; and very sadly insufficient he finds himself. But it is not true that he is callous to his duty because the results of his work are not brilliant or conspicuous even, much less because they do not correspond with the ideal of the critic who has neither knowledge of what he does, nor experience of his responsibility.

But it is of no use to go on expostulating or complaining about ignorant criticism : rather let me just, in a few

words, note some of the real points of proposed reform and warrantable criticism, and then devote a few moments to the consideration of that defence of Anglicanism, the question of Establishment, and the reproach which is made against us of being more ready to defend the goods of the Church of England than the law and teaching of the Church of Christ.

Church Patronage.

The reform in the matter of patronage has long been before the minds of friends and enemies alike. I believe that the measures now before Parliament will, if they become law, meet some of the strongest and real true objections to the present state of things, which is not really a system, but the result of a number of experiments, partial in their application and tentative in their very nature, made, through several centuries, to meet particular cases of rights and wrongs.

(a) Its History.

The history of patronage goes a very long way back in European history; the provision for the ministers of the Gospel, like the provision for the life and happiness of everybody else, depends on material conditions which are inextricably connected with temporal regulations. The law of the land secures them, and without the law of the land they cannot be secured; for supposing the clergy to live upon alms, those alms cannot be given, or received, except under the permission, the sanction, the security of law. And the long history of endowment is a section of legal as well as Church history. The utmost that the Church could do in the matter of regulating the existing use of patronage would be to try to create such a feeling of living responsibility in the people as would insure the maintenance and enforcement of legal and justifiable rights in legal and justifiable ways. The efforts of ecclesiastical statesmen have constantly and consistently been directed to this aim: and the present proposals bear this on the face of them. But we cannot

have a rectification of abuses without some sort of loss to those who have a sort of vested interest in the existing abuses. Hence delays, and objections, and complaints of hardship which require equitable and, therefore, patient, possibly slow, treatment. I trust that such will be afforded in the Patronage Act when it has become law. Some points in it are beyond criticism, such as the provisions for getting rid of incapable ministers, and the like, which are simply enforcements of conditions under which alone the trust of patronage can be conscientiously exercised. I allow that much more remains: the prevention of unfit appointments is the most important. And this is one of the points of Church Reform which is so often inconsiderately and ignorantly put forward from very different quarters; some people insisting on the right of the parishioners to choose their own clergyman without any consideration of the rights of patrons or the means of providing for him; others advising an unrestricted veto; and others recommending an arrangement by which the patron, the Bishop, and the parishioners might be brought into concordant action. And this last would seem equitable, provided it were feasible, for it recognises at once the right of authority, of corporate liberty of action, and of proprietary patronage. But all these plans are open to the evil, the unhappily original sin, of all elective processes; they cannot be unanimous, they cannot avoid competitive and divided ingredients, they would prepare in every parish a strong basis of opposition to every clergyman who could not secure a unanimous constituency, an accommodating, conscientious, and disinterested patron, and a Bishop who had no prejudices. It may be sufficient to say that the elective plan fails wherever it is tried, and besides its failure, produces a struggle of advocacy, canvassing, jealousy, heartburnings, and oppressive obligations which must be fatally prejudicial to the work of the very best man who has succeeded in passing through the ordeal. From such evils, and those that result from them, it will not be hasty, experimental legislation that will rescue us; only the spread of real knowledge of rights, duties, authorities, and

privileges which improving education, in these, as in all other matters, ought to be furnishing to us. There must be one step at a time.

(*β*) Its Administration.

This seems to be an appropriate place for saying a word about the claims that stipendiary assistant curates have in relation to patronage, and of the way in which those claims, and the complaints of some of the body, have been put forth in public and private correspondence within the last few months. There is no difficulty in seeing the justice of the claim for recognition, or the soreness which arises from the neglect of it. But there is no general or widely prevailing neglect of it, least of all in the quarters which are most loudly called to account by the advocates of the peremptory claims of the curates. It does seem to me that there are two radical prejudices which are introduced at the very outset of the discussion. The one sole and sufficient principle which every patron of a benefice has to set before him is that he should seek the fit man for it. I am sure that that is the principle with the vast majority of private and public patrons; I must exclude of course that class against which the legislation or patronage is directly aimed. The one point is to get the right man in the right place. The two prejudicial influences that I mentioned are, first, the idea that all pastoral work is very much alike, so that the place, wherever it may be, and whatever the sort of its inhabitants and its traditions, may be satisfied with any man of ordinary or average competency; and, second, the idea that all qualified clergymen are pretty much alike, their accomplishments experience, and natural qualifications making little or no difference in relation to the work entrusted to them. Of course, so stated the absurdity is patent. No two places are alike, no two men are equal—but the idea is there; and we are told practically that in selecting and accepting candidates for ordination, we are stamping them with a mark that qualifies them for any sort of pastoral work. With this in view as to principle, what do we find in fact and practice? Many curates have to wait

for many years before they obtain livings, many marry on precarious and insufficient incomes, and many find themselves from time to time associated with incumbents who cannot work with them, or with whom they cannot work. These three grounds of grievance are incidental to all professional life; and, gladly as we would see the professional difficulties of clergymen made as small as they can be made, no system can possibly avoid them all. I do not know that I need lay much stress on the appeals which I occasionally receive, urging me not to ordain so many men, on the ground that the supply of curates is greater than the demand, that the increase of the supply creates undue competition, and consequent lowering of stipends with the accompanying drawbacks. I cannot lay much stress upon this, knowing as I do the difficulty that every incumbent who wants a curate finds in securing one, not to say in securing the sort of man he wants. There is no such glut, no such competition among the well-qualified, trusted, and proved men. Nor is it on behalf of such men, speaking generally, that the peremptory claims are made. I would not say anything harsh or unsympathetic; no doubt there are here and there cases of neglected merit, cases of merit which inseparable circumstances, of sorts which I need not specify, make it impossible for prudent patrons to recognise.

Now, however, without respect of persons, qualifications or disqualifications, it is peremptorily demanded that the status of assistant curates should have such recognition:—that they should have a recognised claim to promotion, stipends allotted which should be at all events adequate to the maintenance of the decencies of family life, and that there should be fixity of tenure, that is, that the curate should not be liable to arbitrary dismissal at the will of his incumbent. As to the first of these claims, we must understand that it is made on behalf of the older members of the body of curates—for, as a matter of fact, every man who holds a living at all—with a very few exceptions, growing annually fewer—every beneficed clergyman has been a curate, ordained on a title to a curacy, and trained with some experience of a curate's life. Bishops do not pass over

old curates in order to appoint young ones to benefices, unless the latter have distinct qualifications which the former have not; chiefly, I should imagine, that of adaptableness to new fields and methods of work. But in this article of promotion there is a great deal of exaggeration; I have gone through the list of appointments which I have made to the livings in my gift since I became Bishop of Oxford—dividing them into cases of vacancy by resignation, death, and promotion by other patrons. There seem to be about fifty altogether, many of them caused by my removing men to other livings; in nearly every such case of a normal vacancy a curate has been nominated to the vacant living, or to that which the removal of the previous incumbent has made vacant. I cannot say that it has been so in all cases, because in some the benefice was so poor that I could not find a man to undertake it, without going outside the diocese; but in the great majority it has been so; and where it has not been so, that is where I have removed an incumbent into another living, in the end a curate has been appointed, I imagine in the long run, in every case. For every definite normal vacancy a curate has been promoted, for the very sufficient reason that there was nothing but a curate to promote.

It is grievous to have to think of the cases in which parishioners have taken on themselves to dictate to the patrons the appointment of curates to the benefices in which they have served; more grievous when they themselves ask for it. I need hardly say that such instances, although rare, are not unknown. It may be said in defence of them that such petitions are a natural way in which parishioners can testify their sense of the curate's merits, and that this is the idea, rather than the desire, of securing his continued services. If so, little weight need be attached to such memorials. But certainly the cases in which a patron will be wise in accepting the suggestion are few and far between. Almost invariably the growth of personal partisanship is promoted by such things, and difficulties sown in the way of the new incumbent whether the curate succeeds or no.

I do not see how the matter could have been mended by passing over the claims of hardworking incumbents simply because they were incumbents; and offering everything in the first instance to a curate simply because he was a curate. I adduce my own experience in this matter, because I am patron of a larger number of livings than anyone else in the diocese; but I feel that my conclusion must be modified by the fact that a very large proportion of the benefices in the diocese are very poor, and that poor incumbents who are qualified for the posts to which I remove them, have, as I have said, so far as claim is concerned, as good a claim for consideration as any curate could make.

And this consideration affects also the second demand, that is, for an adequate sustentation. So far as my experience goes, a good curacy is a better and more satisfactory sustentation than a poor incumbency. But I need not enlarge upon this; I quite agree that both curates and poor incumbents do deserve and require improved incomes. I think that the answer will have to be found in a well-sustained national effort for all; I hope that the remedy will not be sought, as it certainly will not be found, in the direction of a class agitation.

Incumbents and Curates.

The third claim, for fixity of tenure, is in its nature more serious; in its practical bearing it has less real importance, and demands less sympathy on general grounds. It is of absolutely essential importance that in a parish where the assistance of a curate is required, there should be entire working sympathy between curate and incumbent. The responsibility must lie with the man who has the cure of souls, and the administration of the work in church and out must be directed by him. If the working sympathy is there, there will be an approach to equality—that is, the curate will remonstrate if he sees anything wrong, advise if he sees how things can be improved, submit to the superior authority on matters in which his advice is not taken; but the incumbent will also advise

and take advice, and gladly accept such improved methods as the younger man has learned to be desirable. But if they differ to a degree in which working sympathy is impossible, the Bishop cannot arbitrate in disputes where the status of disputants is so conditioned; they must separate. The existing law makes it easy; beyond the rule of the existing law, fixity of tenure is impracticable. The incumbent may, with the Bishop's leave, give six months' notice to the curate; the curate, with the same leave, can give three; the Bishop will probably advise that where the breach is irreparable the time should be shortened. I do not think that he can wisely refuse the permission to give the notice, nor do I think that any appeal or substitution of another authority for the Bishop's would be of any avail. No parish can be worked with a divided command, or without cordial relation. It does not follow that the incumbent is always in the right, but unless he is so far in the wrong as to subject himself to legal and canonical animadversion, he must be allowed to hold his own. The curate has his advantage in giving way: however completely he may be in the right in the matter of difference, he cannot maintain a position which is irreconcilable with the proper authority of the incumbent and the working of the parish. Fixity of tenure would mean parochial paralysis by party warfare. He is very ill-advised if he misuses his advantage and tries to pose as a martyr, or to maintain as a grievance the solution of a temporary contract which the law has made easy for him. In cases in which the difference between the two clergymen arises from misconduct, or eventuates in conduct for which the curate's licence has to be revoked, he has his right of appeal to the Archbishop of the province; when that is done he has, of course, ample means for ventilating his grievance and extenuating his offence, but there is a woe unto those by whom such offences come, which we do well to look at all round. I see no possibility of any such fixity of tenure for curates as is contemplated. I have spoken at length about this because two or three cases, which have come before me in my diocesan work, have shown that

there are misunderstandings in the matter which it is as well to put an end to. I need not add that the good offices of Bishop and Archdeacon may always be used to reconcile reconcilable disputes, or to arbitrate on matters capable of arbitration, but that neither reconciliation nor arbitration will suffice to restore the sympathetic working of two men in one parish where it has so far broken down as to call for such manipulation.

Clerical Poverty.

Another point, which is closely connected with the matter I am speaking of, and which forces itself very sensibly upon us from day to day, is the increasing cry of clerical poverty. I have nothing new, and nothing more comforting to say upon the subject than that I really believe that the Church laity are beginning to realise the state of things, and to see that the ancient endowments of the Church neither are, nor are capable of being made, sufficient for the present occasions. They are beginning to see that a general effort must be made to provide a central fund; I believe that they are trying to devise the best means for securing such a provision and of administering it to the greatest effect.

It has long been clear that the local and temporary efforts that are made can meet only local and temporary emergencies. The revenues at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are being very rapidly appropriated in perpetuity, and, at no very distant time, the sources from which any increase of such income could be looked for will be exhausted. The value of tithe and the rent of glebe are falling, or fallen so low, that even the few well-endowed benefices—I speak mainly from the experience of my two dioceses—even the well-endowed benefices that still subsist can do little more than meet their actual expenses. In a great many parishes the reduction or absolute loss of income from lands unlet and tithes unrecovered places the clergyman in a condition in which he is unable to minister at all to the temporal wants of his people. The average, or I should say, recognised

normal stipend of an assistant curate, £150, is beyond what in a great number of livings the incumbent has to meet all the demands that charity, and I may say even honest payment of his bills, make upon him. It follows, as we know well, that in very many cases the parish work is carried on by the clergyman on the support of his private fortune; and I thank God that in this diocese I have the help of very many men who are glad to contribute in this way to His service. But it is not fair that we should have to depend upon this. And it is not wise to depend upon its continuing to be so.

I remember, more than twenty years ago, at the Church Conference at Leeds, having to point this out. Fifty years ago the clerical profession was regarded as a profession in a temporal sense remunerative: wealthy men educated their sons for good livings; and men of moderate means and aims worked hard to provide means for a son or two who showed leanings in the right direction to go to the University and prepare himself for a life that had a good deal of promise for prudent, faithful, loyal service. Of course, we all know that there were sad drawbacks in many cases, and that the scandals that occurred, when and where the speculation failed, were not a few: but on the whole they were exceptional. The young men were, as a rule, trained to maintain such moral and social standard of living as would not disgrace the calling for which they were intended; they had constantly before them the prospect of a life full of spiritual work and obligation; and I believe that I am justified in saying that, in the result, this professional view of their parents produced for the Church a large, a very large number of devoted servants; many of whom have lived to recognise that their parents' views were far too sanguine, to realise the happiness of being able to spend as well as be spent for the work of the Church, and help to keep in countenance and to sustain their poorer brethren. That sort of idea is a thing of the past; no parent, out of mere prudent foresight of worldly prospects, would now think of bringing up a son as a clergyman. We see, how, unhappily,

family livings are forced into the market, and we pity the mistaken parents that make for their children such fatal investments. The destruction of the poor is their poverty, and the destruction of a good many people who are not poor is in the misuse of the means they take to avoid it.

Well, I am thankful to say, this is not an exhaustive statement ; happily, whether or no their parents do it for them, still many young men who have worldly means are willing to devote themselves and their fortune to the good work, and such devotion is in itself better than the other. But it is a quantity and quality that cannot be brought under practical calculation. In a general way, the clergy are poorer men, and clerical prospects are poorer prospects than they have been for a hundred years. There are fewer and fewer clergymen who can, and fewer and fewer benefices that will enable their incumbents to, educate their children in the same way that they were educated themselves ; and this surely is the minimum that an average professional life should offer.

Episcopal Incomes.

It is, I fear, hardly decorous for me, speaking to a number of men who know these things and feel with me, to advert to the constant reproach that we hear from men and parties, who assail us with the demand for the redistribution of ecclesiastical revenue, on the plea, as it would seem, that the value of all men's services is much the same, and that Bishops and Deans and Chapters should be reduced to stipends and salaries that would leave a large margin for the equilisation of parochial incomes. I think that, after ten years of an episcopal income, I can truly say, and am justified in saying it, that it does not place its earner in a position that on pecuniary grounds is to be coveted ; his income may be increased sevenfold, his liabilities are increased seventy-and-sevenfold ; when the absolutely inseparable charges and obligations are satisfied, the man who holds it finds himself, as the successful lawyer when he becomes a judge, considerably poorer than he might fairly reckon on being if he had chosen to retain

the way of making his own living, which, supposing him to be a person qualified for his post, he may be understood to have held before promotion. The appropriation of the income of the see of Oxford to the increase of parochial incomes in the diocese would add an average sum of some £7 10s. to each; and that would, of course, mean the cessation of such work and help as the Bishop, who, on the theory of our critics, is an unnecessary excrescence in other respects, is expected to provide. I need not dilate on this; for indeed, as you know, these speculations on the wealth of the Bishops and Chapters are all calculations on the theory that such officers are not only unnecessary, but mischievous parts of ecclesiastical machinery; with such a prejudice you, I conceive, have no sympathy.

Reform of Convocation.

Of the points of constitutional interest, then, which are put forward in the tentative projects of Church Reform I will mention the Reform of Convocation and the scheme for altering the mode of appointment of Bishops.

It is not necessary for me to notice the proposal to introduce laymen into the body of the Convocations, further than by pointing out that such a measure would destroy the essential and historical character of the institution, which, if it is worth preservation at all, can only be maintained as the representative council of the spirituality. That the Church should have a council in which the learned and faithful laity should have their place and weight, may well be an object of desire; it may be growing up in the association of the Houses of Laymen with the Convocations, or in the central committee of diocesan conferences, but it must be allowed time for growth and consideration, and not be adopted as an experiment of tentative reform.

Union of Two Houses.

Of the idea of uniting the two Convocations in one consultative or quasi-legislative body, I have spoken my mind at considerable length at diverse times; I will not repeat

myself now. I believe that the practical benefits of such co-operation as is requisite can be secured without departure from constitutional precedent, and are being realised now in the sympathetic mutual confidence of the two provincial assemblies.

The point, however, which is most prominent at this moment is the possibility of changing the system of representation in the Lower House of Canterbury, in such a way as to insure a more perfect, a more truly representative assembly of the clergy. I do not myself feel any special hardship in the present arrangement, by which the Deans, Archdeacons, Capitular, and Parochial Proctors are regarded as sufficient. I have no objection to the existence of official members like the Deans, who represent a good deal of ecclesiastical learning and authority as well as a side of Church polity on which the State is supposed to have a special influence and interest; or of the Capitular Proctors, some twenty or thirty men of experience, mature age, and knowledge of the world as well as of the Church, gained chiefly in parochial work of the past; nor of the Archdeacons, who add to those qualifications the traditions and experiences of the several administrations of the Bishops who have appointed them; nor do I think that a couple of diocesan Proctors may not be as satisfactory a representation of the parochial clergy as half a dozen. But then, you see, I do not regard the exclusively elective character of representation as the sole requisite for such an assembly as Convocation; and I do think authority of learning and experience as important as that of delegation to express other men's wishes. Still, I see that there are anomalies; and that, where a diocese sends up three Archdeacons to represent authority, it should not be restricted to two Proctors to represent counsel and consent of the body of the diocese. I think, therefore, that a reform which would enable the Archdeaconries, as is the case in the northern province, to return two Proctors a piece would be a fair reform—not as being a more proper delegation than the present, nor merely as an increase in the numbers and possibly also of the influence of

Convocation, but simply as giving fairer proportion to the expression of the wishes of the living and acting clergy.

Whether this could be done without an Act of Parliament is a moot point. The relations of the Convocations to Parliament are complicated in an historical point of view ; and in all dealings with the Parliament, which have for two centuries been very few and far between, a curious historical and personal jealousy has increased the complications. And there have been difficulties between the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation themselves which have always prevented any such cordial presentment of solidarity as would preclude objection on the part of Parliament to recognise rights in Convocation. It is true that the Archbishops are, to all appearance, the authority by which the composition of the representative assemblies of the clergy is to be determined, when under the royal summons the Convocations are called together ; and the Crown lawyers lay great weight on custom as deciding in what way the authority of the Archbishops can and cannot be varied. The theory also that in this province the representative system is a matter of canon, which cannot be altered, in pursuance of the Submission of the Clergy made in 1532—although in the province of York there is no show of such canon, and in that of Canterbury no such text is producible—this theory, combined with the validity of custom, is adduced to prove that a constitutional amplification by the Archbishop's sole power would be insufficient, and that the Parliament would not be justified in regarding as Convocation a body so modified. It may be said, and said truly, that, as matters stand now, it matters little what the Parliament would think of the change, for the occasions on which it recognises Convocation are so few and of so little importance ; but it will not do for us to consider that as an argument. There are many signs, in these days, of change in the attitude of Parliament and in the administration of parliamentary business by devolution or committee, not to speak of local subdivision. And in the view of even a bare possibility that, by-and-by,

some recognition of the voice of the Church in Convocation will be a necessity for Parliament itself, it is well to be on the safe side. There is a Bill now in circulation, the Rubrics Bill, to which I have had occasion to call your attention in another section of my charge, in relation to which it will be of vital importance that the Convocation should have parliamentary recognition, and that definite. Any modification, I conclude, whether or no it may be introduced on grounds of history, constitutional law, or political equity, if it is to be such that the State can regard the Convocation so modified as a true Convocation, will demand at least a strong affirmation of legality by the advisers of the Crown, and possibly a declaratory Act of Parliament. The risks and dangers of such experiments it is not for me to explain at length. They are great; whether they are too great it will be for younger and wiser heads than mine to determine. I think it extremely probable that I shall be regarded, in saying this, as truckling to the opinion of lawyers, and not having courage to urge the importance of desirable reform in the face of their objections. I cannot say that I much mind the reproach; the Parliament and the Crown, when they find that they have to deal with the Church in Convocation, will certainly not allow the determination of the definition of the body with which they have to deal to be settled by the clergy alone; and if they once get their hands at work for the remodelling of the body which they will recognise as Convocation, we cannot be very hopeful as to the nature, or minimum, or maximum, of change. However, all I would urge is an attempt, before anything else is done, to secure such a concordant action between the strong powers in Church and State as will make and be content with necessary changes.

Election of Proctors.

This consideration must be applied also to any project for giving the unbeneficed clergy votes in the election of Proctors. Were the Archbishops to take the bold line of summoning a synod or synods on consistent lines, free

from the custom and tradition of Convocation, all this might be easily done, and I do not see who is to hinder it; but the assembly so called and framed would not be the historic Convocation. My own interest in this subject,—the fact that from the revival of Convocation in 1852 I have been in close association with most of the movements connected with it, and, owing to my personal relation with Archbishop Longley, enabled to study the subject at the fountain head,—must be my defence if I seem to have discussed the matter at too great length.

Election of Bishops.

Another point which is urged with more or less persistency when Church Reform is in discussion, is the election of Bishops. The difficulty of reaching a practical solution of this question has been before the Church from the remotest antiquity; some of the most critical events in the history of ecclesiastical organisation, from the earliest days of the Church, have resulted from it. Nor is it now a simple question of setting aside an inferior method for a superior one, or of a practical one for an ideal. The reconciliation of authority with freedom; the selection from the lower and the authorisation from the higher; the balance between experience and experiment; the security for impartial administration by men placed in their authority by party agency; the continuous missionary character of the Church, with its distinctly constitutional status; these, and very many like considerations, complicate any project of change. No plan which presents any features of cohesion has been as yet proposed as a substitute for the present one, with all its undeniable and undenied faults and weaknesses. I do not propose to go into the history of the processes by which the existing state of the problem was reached, except so far as to repudiate that common misinterpretation of it, which is so often accepted without question, that it is an invention of the Anglican Reformation, of Henry VIII. in particular, and that in the execution of the business of election

forms are used and processes gone through which are open to the charge of unreality and profanation ; that is, that Henry VIII. introduced the practice of forcing the electors to accept his nominees, and that the electors obey the order and execute it, with religious services implying that their choice is free, is directed by divine guidance, and entitled to respect as an authoritative fulfilment of Church law. This misrepresentation adds an element of odium and reproach to the hardship, if it be regarded as a hardship, which consists in the compulsion which is of the theory of the existing law.

The ideal theory of the election of Bishops is that they should be elected by the dioceses over which they are to preside, and receive their authority from the metropolitan and comprovincial Bishops. From very early ages the diocesan power of election fell into the hands of the clergy of the dioceses, and, from the beginning of the Middle Ages, into the hands of the Chapters of the churches in which the Bishop's throne was set up, and which were the mother churches of their dioceses. There is no occasion to go further back than this ; we have to deal with the organisation of national Churches, and that in a quarter of the world in which all national Churches were organised in much the same way. In England we need go no further back than the Norman Conquest. Since that time the course of events has been clear ; before that time, so far as the few incidental illustrations of the matter have come to us, much the same condition of affairs existed. The era of the Conquest was, however, the era of the development of the canonical Chapters ; and they and the monastic Chapters, which already existed in strength, claimed and maintained the right of election of the Bishops. But this very same era saw also the legal development, both of the papal power under Gregory VII. and of that feudal idea which construed the possession of temporal possessions as a matter of regulation by the King and his Courts. So the King, as well as the clergy of the Chapters, and the Pope, with his assumed right of arbitrating on all ques-

tions, come as rival agencies into a very critical field of struggle. Throughout the Middle Ages the appointment of Bishops was the bone of contention between these three. The scheme, the legal rules, the very ritual of ideal canonical election subsisted; the question was, who should nominate the person to be elected, and who should enforce, recognise, and authorise the acceptance of the elect. For two centuries from the Conquest the Chapters contested the right of the Crown to dictate, by methods direct or indirect, the choice of the electors; numerous appeals went to Rome, and the great majority of them were decided in favour of the King's nominees; a considerable number ended in the rejection of both sets of candidates and the nomination of a new candidate; in very few cases indeed were the rights of the Chapters regarded. In the fourteenth century the rights of the Chapters drop almost out of sight, and the very forms of election are mainly kept alive by the processes for choosing Abbots and Deans, in churches where it was not worth while for the two rival powers to quarrel or interfere. From the fourteenth century onward, the appointments were, as a rule, debated between the Crown and the Papacy; where they agreed, the Pope nominated the King's candidate by an act of provision, or the King accepted the Pope's candidate so provided. Sometimes the form of provision supplied all the defects of canonical election; sometimes the whole process was transacted by the regular forms of acclamation, compromise, or scrutiny, as if it were actually spontaneous. It is not easy to disentangle the exact procedure in all cases; but the canonical idea was not lost sight of, nor the form of election forgotten. The King, when there was an election, issued his *congé d'élire*, the Chapter met to elect, a royal letter was produced, recommending an eligible person, and the person so named was elected and presented to the Archbishop for consecration. Any person acting in contempt of the royal letter, and in dependence on any support from the Pope or outside authority, was liable, under the letter of the Acts of Præmunire and Provisors, to be put out

of the King's protection, and suffer forfeiture and imprisonment.

This was the state of things on which Henry VIII., in the Statute of Annates, 25 Henry VIII. c. 20, set the definite seal of legislation; he simply put down in black and white and made it an Act of Parliament, a condition of things already long in existence, out of which he had to eliminate the papal element. He contented himself with eliminating it; the process of appointment, defined in that Act, overthrown under Edward VI. by a plan of nomination by letters patent,—eliminating the very shadow of election or the rights of chapters,—and restored in the first year of Elizabeth, is still the law of the land as it was before the rule and custom of the Church. It is the resultant of several conflicting forces, rights, privileges, usurpations, and compromises, but it was no novelty of the Reformation, and, if to be called a novelty of the Reformation adds an odium to the abuse, it is not obnoxious to that charge. It is anything but a perfect or logical system, but it works. Nothing that has any appearance of practicability in our own national Church system has been proposed to take its place; and no examples from the practice of foreign Churches promise more in the direction of independent, spontaneous, and united action.

Nor can it be said that it is by any Tudorian assumption of the headship or supreme governorship, that the nominating power is exercised as a personal rather than as a constitutional right of the Crown. It existed and was admitted before that theory of personal headship was formulated; and it was always maintained by those who did formulate it that it was a constitutional intrinsic right of the King's, on which the papal interference was a usurpation. Anyhow, it is certain that both before and after the Reformation, under Henry VI., as well as under William III., the appointments were deliberated in council, and under the latter sovereign by a commission of episcopal advisers, whose position, however constitutional or unconstitutional, helped to avert the nomination of personal

and party favourites; for which result even Bishop Burnet may have some credit.

In what I have said I have not, you will understand, attempted more than to show that the existing arrangement is no Reformation, Tudorian, or Anglican novelty. I do not claim for it perfection or finality. It has worked evil, as in the case of Hoadly, as it has worked good in the case of Butler. There is a good providence of Almighty God which overrules the evil and leads on the good to that which is better. We wait for that, now as ever.

The second reproach to which I have referred is that, in the transaction of the process of election, there is a mockery of divine service in the use of prayers for guidance and invocation of the Holy Ghost, when the purpose for which the guidance of the Holy Ghost is asked is already determined. I do not believe that this is done at all, although I do believe that, private and seldom as the occasions of election are, words may be said and forms used on which malicious construction may be put. I cannot imagine any case of the kind in which divine guidance may be more lawfully asked: a divine blessing on a process each step of which may be believed to have been carefully taken. The use of the *Veni Creator* is not out of place, even where, as in the case of our own ordinations, every detail of determination, examination, preparation, has been most completely arranged: we ask guidance, protection, sustentation, under conditions which are practically settled before the rite commences. It is as reasonable to object to the use of the hymn at the consecration as at the election of the Bishop, if the default of fitness lies in the predetermination of the act on which the blessing is implored. That the intervention of the Holy Spirit is taken for granted in one or all of the three methods of election is surely no strange doctrine to those who believe that all good counsels, as well as holy desires and just works, come from Him. It is well that these things should be made clear, and that charity should guide us in judgment when they are not so clear as we should like to have them. Half, if not all, the misrepresentations on these points disappear on a very little careful research.

Pastoral Work.

There are some few subjects upon which I must repeat some of the cautions or remonstrances which I have tried in my former charges to administer, without that imperious and egotistic dogmatism with which, notwithstanding, I have so often been credited. As I have said, 132 benefices have changed hands since 1893; and 132 clergymen or more are not to be left in ignorance of the mind of the diocesan on any point that may seem to him, or to them, of real importance.

(2) Visiting.

And first I am told that among the younger clergy there are some who require to be reminded of the extreme importance of pastoral visitation and school work. I think that this can scarcely be the case with any whom I have myself ordained, and who have listened at all to the admonitions which they have received during the preparatory days immediately preceding the ordination. I am told that there is an idea that work in church, or in the study, is the work to which all other engagements and obligations are to give way; that the priest's office is there, to celebrate, and preach, and advise; that time spent in visitation, except visitation of the sick, is a frivolous expenditure on the priest's part; and that, although the work of the school in its religious side must of necessity be kept in view, the personal participation of the vicar or curate is rather in the way, and does no special good either to the children, or to the teachers, or to himself. This is of course an extreme way of putting things. Now I would not say a word that would discourage any young clergyman from holding the most serious view of his own position, the dignity and weightiness of the charge which he has undertaken; nor would I suggest even that he should try to minimise the cogency of his duty or the privilege of his service in church. I would encourage the multiplication of opportunities in which the priest can lead the devotion, or minister to the spiritual wants of his people in the sanctuary. But we must remember that if the people are to be helped,

they must be taken care of and taken hold of. Nothing is so forlorn as a Church in which the priest has no hold on his people. He must know them individually, if he is to know them collectively; he must know them in their own houses, if he is to know them in church; he must know them in their temporal circumstances, if he is to know them in their spiritual ones; he must earn their sympathy by learning to sympathise with them; and it must be begun in the ways in which they are accessible—first, that which is natural; afterwards, that which is spiritual. This, I am told, is a difficulty: if it is a difficulty which is not overcome by the young curate at once, it will never be overcome; and if it is never overcome, the great pastoral work to which he is sent, for which he is blessed and gifted, to which he is most solemnly bound by his own promise and by the charge of his commission, will be left undone: and what must the result be in himself, as well as in the flock for which he may be said, in this aspect of his life, to exist? Surely he justifies the opinion of those who accuse him of that favourite sin of sacerdotalism—a reproach founded, one would think, on the character of the certain priest, who came down that way, “and, when we saw him, passed by on the other side.” Oh, that was the case with the plundered and wounded man on the way from Jerusalem to Jericho! Yes, and I fear that there are many left half-dead, much nearer home than that, in every parish—neighbours who do not show their wounds until they know the man to whom they may appeal for counsel and cure, but who are very visible to all who are willing to see.

My own advice to the beginner—and it is advice which will be useful to him long after he has familiarised himself with the work, its pleasantness as well as its labour—is, at the very first introduction to your district, to take a book, like the school-attendance book, with columns for names and dates; and make a census of your district; mark the date of every visit, and visit regularly, as often as the claims of your population demand, never letting more than the proportional number of days or weeks pass between the two visits; then visit, not by house-row, like

a distributor of tracts or a collector of rates, but with a distinct individualising of every visit. Give a recognised number of hours in the day to it ; and whilst you watch for every opportunity of saying a word of good in season, do not run into the danger of using or inviting cant and hypocrisy ; give way to yourself in the interest that the flock you are serving will inspire as soon as you know one another ; let them see that you are a friend without thinking it necessary to be telling them so, and know you as a minister of God without your constantly asserting your dignity as a priest : your dignity is in doing the will of Him who sends you : the dignity, the blessedness of the shepherd, is in holding the flock for Him who commits it to the charge of the servant.

Well, there are other ways of learning, ways which any experienced parish priest who has fought the battle, for and with himself, can set before his curate—only let it be done from the first. It cannot be dispensed with. No fine preaching or consummate organising, no mission agitating, or lecturing, or addressing, will do what has to be done, without this individualising of the flock which can only be worked by regular and carefully minded, sympathetic visits. I need not say more about the visitation of the sick : that in some aspects may seem harder to learn, but only experience will teach it ; and I have no reason to believe that labour is begrudged in this : only in this point do not wait to be sent for. You will not as a rule need the summons, for you will, if you have taken my advice, be among the first to know the circumstances and the need.

(b) Schools.

The same principle must underlie the usefulness of the young clergyman's work in schools : he will not have, indeed, the same liberty of opportunity, he cannot choose his times of teaching or multiply the occasions, that may make it easier for him to be regular. But there is the key to usefulness—regularity and the labour to individualise. Of the work itself I need not speak, either of

the religious teaching in class, or the special training of pupil teachers where the clergyman is able to undertake it: that I am sure is a matter on which no man's conscience can let him rest, who has the opportunity. Only one word about the teachers: recognise their office and dignity as fellow-workers; and do it, not by condescending and patronising ways, but by cordially entering into their thoughts and interest; they will teach you much, probably much more than you can teach them; for they can help you to be regular and to individualise, for it is a matter of recognised necessity with them, and you may learn their methods with great advantage to yourselves. But remember that in school they are the principals of authority, and you must respect their authority and make it respected; much of your work, you will find, will have to depend on their help, and on their understanding you. You must help, try to understand, and, as you will both love the children, try to do it without jealousy, or selfishness, or favouritism, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

Public Matters.

And here I should like to put in a consideration, which may not be necessary for you just now and here, but which seems to me to be involved in all attempts at thorough work. I mean the importance of observing a due proportion in working; and that especially in relation to public measures and upon what are called popular ideas. I will mention such, for instance, as the temperance question, the vigilance or purity question, the peace and arbitration question, the social-economical question, and I will add—meaning, I am sure, no disparagement of its importance—such questions as that of the Armenian persecution. There are others of the sort. I only give these as instances. Each of these is a question of far wider interest than the name implies; each point is bound up with a number of others, the bearing of which is a natural and necessary condition of its proper importance. Temperance, soberness, and chastity, peace on earth and good will

towards men, are distinctly parts of primary Christian morality, not to be isolated, as if each or any were the great commandment of the law. Each of these is a matter of public and political import, and as such a matter on which party organisations are framed, party watchwords invented, and partisan methods of reproach adopted, as if the advocates believed that they were the only people who cared about these things, and their way the only way in which evils could be met or reforms attempted. Under these conditions, there must be a division of labour for the carrying on of requisite agitations and the raising of funds for the several purposes in hand, and a certain element of competition and conflict. And there is no doubt that the zeal of the clergy in good works and their general standard of good behaviour qualify them very well for acceptable service in such ways; especially men who have the gift of speaking, or who have such other popular gifts as are found useful.

There is a snare, however, in all this which, unless you guard against it, destroys the proportion of work. I conceive myself bound to give a strong caution. It is not good for a parish priest to sink his character of parish priest in that of a temperance advocate, or a peace advocate, or a denunciator of economical fallacies, or as a promoter of agitation about oppressed causes. Let him do what he can for his cause consistently with his maintenance of the other causes which, in loyalty to his people, he is bound equally to maintain; but if he finds that he must give himself wholly to this one aspect of work, let him give up the post that he is so tempted to neglect, and make the other the substance of his service. Then there is the temptation to political partisanship in reference to these causes. I do not object to a clergyman having strong political views. I have them myself—beliefs rather than views—and I wish that all my brethren had the same, as all politicians really do wish, unless they regard politics as a game of skill. If a clergyman, by his maintenance of the good cause he has at heart, lets himself become the tool of a party with which that good cause

only represents a useful fulcrum for affecting the balance of public opinion ; if he risks doing this by a disproportionate treatment of his work inside or outside church, he is in danger of finding all his life's devotion wasted, his motives interpreted by their results, not by his intention and his usefulness, the debt that he owes to his Lord and his people utterly ruined. Believe me, I know what I am speaking about, and, recognising to the full the importance of having the Church and her ministers well forward in every good word and work, at the same time earnestly deprecate this side of religious agitation. It is this feeling which has led me to discourage the assigning and setting apart of certain Sundays, as Peace Sundays, Temperance Sundays, Unity Sundays, and such like. Temperance, peace, and unity are objects of the most careful and earnest consideration and prayer, but I cannot make the Sunday service of God a mere weapon of disproportionate agitation, any more than I would encourage a parish priest, at the cost of his parish work and of the proportion of his religious teaching, to become the mere instrument of a social movement. I may be wrong, I am pretty sure to be misinterpreted, but I try to tell you what I mean ; and I am sure that your own experiences will furnish you with examples that may well be warnings.

I shall be told that I discourage zeal. Well, zeal without proportion, and not according to knowledge, is not the sort of thing that I should care to encourage. Zeal, even without knowledge, is better than apathy, and a clergyman who does nothing is worse than the one who does something, though not wisely. True, but I am not supposing myself to be speaking of or to clergymen who are apathetic and care to do nothing. I should scarcely think such men worth speaking to, as I am trying to speak now.

There are two or three things which, as I am speaking about parochial work, I will note here.

Evening Communion.

I must repeat what I have said on former occasions about the practice of Evening Celebrations of the Holy

Communion. I do, in the most sincere earnestness, deprecate the introduction of controversial arguments and controversial practices into the region of the sacraments; and more especially into the administration of that which, in all Churches and religious communities throughout the whole world, is believed to be the highest of the means of grace, and at the same time the most typical and substantive expression of the union of the faithful. In this diocese, Evening Communion is the rare exception to very general practice. I believe that both Bishop Wilberforce and Bishop Mackarness did their utmost to discourage it; and before Bishop Wilberforce's time it was practically unknown. I am urging no novelty, nor issuing any arbitrary mandate, when I say that I most earnestly hope that no new attempt will be made to introduce it, and that where it has been tried and failed, it will be allowed to disappear. Where it has been tried and not failed, I wish to urge nothing peremptory; in such cases a consideration has to be taken as to the balance of good or bad consequences that would be likely to follow on any enforcement of a rule. I do not dream of enforcing a rule. Practically my action is confined to dissuasion and remonstrance. And I am not ignorant, either, of the authority and argument by which the practice has been and is sustained; indeed I believe that in many cases the adoption of it has been pressed owing to the very strength of the belief in the necessity of the sacrament for salvation, and the desire to bring in to the Table of the Lord every sort and condition of Christian people who, by any arrangement, can be so brought in, "that My House may be filled." But, with all this before me, and a mind open to what has been said on both sides, and with a very earnest desire to avoid even the appearance of trying to make my opinion a law to others, I am convinced that the usage is out of accord with the spirit of our religious habit, with the whole tone of our services, with the almost universal feeling of the clergy of the diocese and of most other dioceses, and with the ancient tradition of the Church. If anywhere, as has been reported, this practice has been introduced as a mark

of sectarian or party zeal, I regard such introduction as nothing less than a profanation, scarcely less than a sacrilege.

Fasting Communion.

And the same I must say about the peremptory enunciations which are sometimes reported on the subject of Fasting Communion. I believe that the early morning is the proper time for Communion, when the mind is free and rested, and no special interference with devout thought or condition is to be apprehended from the condition of the body, from either repletion or want of sustenance. I believe that, where that is impossible, the Communion following Morning Prayer, when the first and unavoidable worries of morning letters have passed away, has very peculiar advantages in the freedom of thought, the possibility of concentration, the preparation furnished by the Mattins and sermon, and the absence of any compulsion of hurry. I do not myself think that the physical condition of fasting is necessary for worthy receiving, although the long and continuous tradition of Church law does prescribe it — *mos pro lege*; that long and continuous tradition in divers Churches has been largely modified, in some by the infrequency of actual Communion, non-communicating attendance being so common; and in others the extension of rules of moderate eating and drinking, practically putting an end to the ancient and mediæval practice of fasting in the sense of material abstinence. And there is further to be considered the risk of depreciating the spirituality of sacramental agency in the minds of the half-educated; a risk which tells in two opposite ways alike, I think, in their inconsistency with the scriptural doctrine of sacraments, as with that of our Prayer Book and Articles.

In this mind I should protest against the absolute and intolerant enforcement of a rule which is certainly not of authoritative institution; still more against the idea that formal abstinence is a *sine quâ non* of worthy receiving; and most of all and most especially against the inculcation

of the idea that mortal sin is incurred by communicating without previous fast—a previous fast which, so far as its duration, its physical action on mind and body, and its legal sanction also, are concerned, seems to be outside reasonable definition or any uniformity of reasonable rule.

I say this, as of Evening Communion, not in ignorance of what is and has been said and done, nor, indeed, in ignorance altogether of what will be said and done, in reference to this expression of my opinion about these matters. But I would not have you ignorant of what I also presume to think is best in accord with faith and ancient practice.

Sunday Worship.

I very much wish that I could have stopped here, and been able to omit any further comment on proceedings connected with ritual. I am most thankful to be able to believe that, in this diocese, there is a very general acceptance of the customary interpretation of the law of the Church in this matter, together with a recognition of the limits within which attempts at change, development, or advance, as it is called, can be allowed to work, subject to the legal restrictions and definitions of competent authority. And I am also thankful for the way in which the clergy as a rule have shown themselves loyal to me, where I have been called on to regulate, or to advise, on the questions which have from time to time arisen. But I cannot leave you for a moment in doubt as to my opinion on the un wisdom of the changes which I see occasionally attempted, doubtless with the righteous purpose of putting the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper more prominently before the people as the greatest and highest act of worship, but with the certain result of dragging it into unwholesome controversy in ignorant or uninformed opinion.

To attenuate the congregational services of Morning and Evening Prayer; to put them at inconvenient hours; to reduce the solemnity of the Psalms and Lessons; to put the General Confession, the prayers and thanksgivings,

distinctly on a lower level than they have been from time immemorial, is by itself a most unhappy departure from good rule and precedent, and takes away from ordinary people a portion of the worship to which they are most fondly attached, and to which, however disproportionately they may do it, they cannot possibly ascribe a higher value than it possesses. This is done, I understand, in order to throw the celebration of the Holy Communion into higher relief—a most intolerably unworthy piece of bad policy. But when it is followed up by the introduction of musical celebrations, at which the bulk of the congregation is expected not to communicate; when the great mystery of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is transacted before the eyes of the people who are to take no part in the Communion; when it is held out as a form of educating the children in the ritual of the service, for the teaching familiarity with an ordinance which is the greatest privilege of the faithful, the dearest and most solemn approach to the Lord—then I cannot withhold the severest sentence of disapproval. I shall not speak more strongly, or I should be unable to restrain bitter words myself. I trust that the clergy who have been looking in the direction I have spoken of will look back. If they are loyal they will; they will not make of these things party watchwords, or steps of advancing policy in religious progress, as they may deem it; they will not misuse the liberty that we have striven so hard to secure for them in the vindication of the true interpretation of the law of the Church; they will not drag the Sacrament through the mire of controversy—a controversy in which they are guilty who risk dishonour to the Lord's Body, far more guilty than those who, not discerning it, cannot be judged as sinning against knowledge and conscience of right, when they use the arguments and impute the motives of irreverent and profane contention. You are not showing forth the Lord's death until He come, but putting before those who are incapable of realising the occasion, or are prejudiced against the doctrine of the Sacrament, the temptation to count the blood of the

covenant wherewith ye are sanctified an unholy thing, and to do despite unto the Spirit of Grace. I do not by any means say that all this is involved in the practice that I have referred to, but it is involved in the controversial dealings to which they give provocation. I am sorry if what I have said gives pain to any who hear or read my words. But I am not sent to guide you or to advise you merely to do the things that you like and as you like; one part of my mission is to try at least to set before you what I have been taught and proved as the good and the right way, and to warn you against the mischiefs of letting your good be evil spoken of.

Sunday Amusements.

On the subject of Sunday observance, a matter which has been again brought forcibly before us by the vote in the House of Commons on the opening of museums, I suppose that it is right for me to repeat what I have said on other occasions.

I have been taught and accustomed to teach that the obligation of Sunday is discharged by devout worship of God in especial service, and by abstaining from the worldly labours, servile or not servile, which constitute the professional work of the week or the manual labour of the week, or the secular occupation, to put it generally, of the other six days. The predominant idea is the holiness which is to pervade both the worship and the rest. I cannot say that I regard the compulsory abstinence from innocent amusement, or innocent reading and relaxation, at all a part of the proper obligation. I cannot say that the spending an hour in a picture-gallery is at all more, to my mind, a breach of the observance than the listening for an hour to an organ recital, or to the reading, by an eloquent reader, of a sensational book.

In and by itself, disconnected with the idea of imposing work on the servants of the museums and picture-galleries, I cannot regard the opening of them or the visiting of them to be a breach of the religious obligation.

But I am not so sure that the measure is at all a wise

one, regarded in its bearing on the balance of public opinion, or on the religious views of people who hold strict opinions and even convictions upon it. There are, unfortunately, large classes of well-meaning people in this country to whom the strict observance of traditional Sunday seriousness is the most distinct point of religion regarded as external. It is a grievous thing that they should be shaken in anything which constitutes a real hold of religious obligation. I do not allege this as a reason for opposing the change, but as a reason for dealing with it as tenderly as may be. If the keeping of Sunday is to them the only outward and visible sign of religion, small as the weight that can be attached to such a consideration may be, it is not to be left out of the calculation. There is also the objection to Sunday labour involved in this ; of which I need say nothing.

Education.

On the burning question of religious education it is perhaps not wise, and it is certainly unnecessary, for me to speak at any length to you now. It is unnecessary because you have known my mind on the subject for seven years and more ; and I know yours, having experience of the assurance of sympathy and effectual help that I have had from you during those years, in the attempts to prevent the transfer of Church schools to school boards in various parts of the diocese. Those attempts have been, with a few unfortunate exceptions, very successful. In one or two cases the transfer has been a matter of absolute necessity, owing to the very peculiar circumstances of parishes and the conditions of the existence of the Church schools, such as the impossibility of securing sites, and the arbitrary mapping out of school districts. In one or two it has resulted from definite and blameable *laches* on the part of managers, who did not even take the trouble to ask to be helped. In none, I think, was it the result of that treasonable faint-heartedness which was most to be feared. I thank most sincerely all who have helped me.

The Church Catechism.

I said that perhaps it is not wise for me to say much about the matter now, for whilst the whole new plan of the present Government is being debated in and out of Parliament, it is not quite in order for me to express peremptory decisions about details; and further, whilst the contest is hot, any stray word which in even a visitation charge may be rashly uttered, is watched for and used with controversial colouring and controversial pertinacity. I need say no more than that the multiplication of weak arguments against so large a scheme as the Government scheme seems to be, the multiplication of weak arguments, urged with the violence with which only weak arguments can make themselves heard, appears to me to tell very much in its favour. I will not say more; but one word against compromise on the great point, the freedom in schools to teach the Church Catechism. The present is the third great crisis that I have witnessed since my ordination, although I am old enough to remember that first crisis in 1839, which has affected the balance of opinion and the line of administration through the other three. There was the long struggle about the Conscience Clause, in which, whether we were right or wrong, we were loyal to our convictions so far as, in the then existing circumstances, convictions could be formulated. Second came the struggle of 1870 and the restrictive formula of the Cowper-Temple Clause, on which a great part of the difficulties of the last twenty-six years have turned—a clause which, called and accepted as a compromise, was never worked as a compromise, was not a compromise essentially, and in practice had no such result. The school-board system, anyhow, was only one-half, and the smaller half, of the administrative system then adopted; and yet for it now the title of national system is freely assumed and exclusively appropriated. Now we are in a third stage, I pray God a happier one. We claim that the teaching of the Catechism should not be forbidden in schools maintained by the payments of Churchmen. We claim for our children that they shall

have a conscience clause, and not be restricted to teaching which, by negation or exclusion, is a compulsory inculcation of what we believe to be injurious to their moral and spiritual welfare.

It has always been a curious question with me what could be the meaning of the opposition of the Dissenters to the teaching of the Catechism. It cannot be objection to the dogma, for there is not a point in the doctrinal statements of the Catechism that would not be accepted by any body of orthodox Dissenters. I can scarcely think that the Unitarians can class themselves with these, certainly we cannot. It cannot be objection to the morality of the teaching, for that is simply, clearly, and comprehensively put, the very basis of all morality, with the duty towards God as the motive power of the law that prescribes the morality. To the sacramental teaching of the opening and finishing questions, with one very clear and definite exception, that of the Baptists, it is difficult to say what objections could have been raised at the time that sectarian differences began the work of dissent. Of course it is clear that, since these differences developed, doctrines and practices have been thrown aside by most of the Dissenting schools which were not the special objects of their opposition when they were founded; but that development has been the result of the disuse of the teaching of the Catechism, not the cause or excuse or justification of it. In simplicity and definiteness, merely as a religious composition, this teaching of the Church compares favourably with any other symbolical manifesto that we have ever known, Scottish or Genevan, Lutheran or Tridentine. It is too indefinite for some schools, but it is not too definite nor too dogmatic for any school of Christians who hold the validity of the three formulæ on which it is based.

Believing this to be the case, and not believing that mere definiteness can be made an objection to it by sincerely minded people, I am obliged to conclude that it is the claim to authoritative teaching which is in the mind of those who, sinking all definite differences in the as-

sumption of the title of Free Churches, set themselves in array against it. It is not much of an answer to say that we are free too, free to assert our respect for authority, free to declare our debt to the instruction that we have lived by, free to profess the doctrines of the Church which, believing it to be the Body of the Lord, we know to be the presentment of our collective and several life in Him. It is not much of an answer to say that our perfect freedom is quite compatible with the service which we have realised in the experience of our life; that we base the vitality of our loyalty on the freedom with which we have given ourselves to it. We claim our right as Christians to have our children taught belief, and we claim our right as Englishmen not to have them taught to dispense with belief, at the cost of funds of which we pay so great a part. We claim our right to have religious teaching, and not to be forced to non-religious teaching, at our own expense, to our own loss. It is not much of an answer, but it ought to be sufficient. To our own questionings and anxieties there is a far more cogent one, which will suggest itself to all of you.

Let it be recognised that the original offence of the Catechism is its authoritative character. If that be regarded by straight-thinking people as an incurable fault, it is hard to justify any teaching at all on any subject perhaps, but arithmetic; and even then children may be left to their own experience to discover that two and two, as a rule, if there be such a rule, make four.

It would, I suppose, be called a truism or a platitude if I were to say that a great deal of the established Nonconformity of the present day, by which the opposition to our teaching is fostered, arises from the dislike of authority more than from any more definite motive, such as doctrinal or administrative differences. It has been always so in great measure, and most especially during periods of great temporal developments and in the classes of people who have risen and flourished by independent enterprise. It is not to be wondered at: a man who, by perseverance, self-reliance, and bold enterprise has made

his way in the world ; an age which has seen the enormous progress made by self-help in material things ;—very naturally extends the action of the self-help, the self-reliance, the persevering self-will to the region of spiritual life. Self-made men are very liable to the temptation to make their own religion, and, unless they have thoughtfulness and knowledge of what the course of religious thought has been, to formulate their own beliefs in their own way, to choose for religious companionship one of the forms of community which offers them the greatest show of freedom, which makes the least demand of restriction of that private judgment which, in other regions of thought, they have learned to trust. There is not in this sort of Dissent that schismatic element which breaks from the Church because of a definite renunciation of her dogmatic teaching : nor of the conservative heredity which, in the second generation, appears as established Dissent. Of this we have to take account quietly but earnestly. We are not to brandish the curse of schism against the one or the other section of our competitors in the religious arena. But we are not to conceal our belief, or act as if we did not hold it, that the teaching we offer is the teaching of the Lord and His apostles, and of the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. We pray that all our people may accept it as of their own well-weighed and convinced belief, and that their children, from generation to generation, may hold it fast ; but it is not on their freedom of choice or faithfulness to that which they have received that we base the conviction of truth or the duty to teach. It is on the authority of the Word of God, and on nothing less or other than the faith once delivered to the saints. Let none take offence at this, as if it meant offence ; rather let us work, in meekness and fear, to give a good account of what we believe, and why we believe it.

Optimism and Pessimism.

There are some thoughts that occur to me, now under the pressure of overwork, now under the enforced inactivity that follows overwork, which are painful and oppressive in

the extreme. I am not, as you are probably aware, a close student of religious newspapers ; perhaps you may think that, if I were so, I should attach less importance to the things that I am referring to. But I do see them from time to time, and hear the matters discussed in them talked over not unfrequently. I cannot help inferring, from what I read and hear, that there are regions of clerical life and thought in which there is a spirit of discontent and disquiet at work, especially amongst the junior clergy. How far I am to suspect that it works in this diocese, of course, I cannot say, for if any feel this sort of misgiving, I should probably be the last person to whom they would speak of it. I hope that there is little of it, but there can be no doubt about its existence.

Now, of course, there are two unconstitutional views of most things, optimism and pessimism. I confess that as a rule my sympathies are in the direction of optimism, which certainly gives play to the energies of faith, hope, and charity, as pessimism does not. But there are many intermediate states of mind, temporary phases of common sentiment, and occasional frames and feelings of individual condition, which may depend on very different causes from serious thought or conviction. Now the mildest optimism is fatal when it refuses to recognise abuses that must be corrected, as the gentlest pessimism is fatal when it sneers at and discourages everything that tries to work in hope. And we cannot deal with extremes of either kind or with the policies that are dictated by either. Still, the workings of the two influences are not equally to be disregarded as unpractical ; and of the two, the workings of pessimism are both the most dangerous and the most painful.

Disloyal Use of Words.

In the matters of Church life and work, and religious thought and relations, there is a line of discontent which verges on disloyalty. And this is the particular phenomenon which, in a few words, I wish to comment on : the tendency to put the lowest estimate on the present, the historical,

the prospective conditions of things ; to impute the lowest motives to all who have to take public action ; to treat as cant and unreality the motives and methods of those with whom you disagree, and to minimise from every point of view the position and claims of the Church of our baptism. You cannot fail to have been struck with the disparaging use of the word *Anglicanism* in particular : you hear it as if it necessarily implied narrowness of view and feeling, self-concentrated isolation, opposition to everything catholic and primitive, a policy of the most contracted character, a principle and presentment of unproductive, undeveloping religious conservatism.

I think that the use of the word, in places where it seems to mean this, is malignant and unworthy. We might, I think, remember that it is as Anglicans that we have any claim to be Catholics at all, and that our hold on the Church Catholic is by our hold on the Church of England. But the matter is more serious than the question of misuse of the word. The word means a great deal, and expresses a great deal of doctrine, practice, organisation, and historical experience.

Another word that is often so misused as to be brought into contempt is the word *Establishment*. It is used as if the position which the word implies were a disgraceful position, as if it implied relations of the Church to the State of England that are simply derogatory to the character of the Church as a part of the Body of Christ, and as if the word itself comprised the whole history of the Church of England, its constitution, and its organic working. Nay, we are given distinctly to understand that the defence of the Establishment of the Church implies or involves the mere protection of temporal status and endowment, and carries with it contempt or carelessness about spiritual things as not worth defending. We might reflect that, at the lowest idea of the interpretation of the word, it can mean not less than the legal protection of the ways and means that we have of doing the work of Christ in England, and at the highest it can mean no more than the recognition of a life, power, duty, and order,

which the State cannot give or take away, but which it does acknowledge to be real, and, in that acknowledgment, declares the English nation to be Christian and Catholic.

One bad result of the disloyal use of these expressions is that in common talk Anglicanism is coming to be understood as the English religion minus its Catholic elements, and Establishment the organisation of the Church minus its spiritual character : two very false uses, you are sure ; and another is that it puts into the mouth of hostile critics forms of reproach which are utterly undeserved. It is not the Romanist alone that sneers at Anglicanism and Establishment. I remember, a few years ago, when by the really most liberal of our liberal critics, himself a Christian and a Churchman, the missionary work of the English Church was described as an attempt to overlay or veneer (I do not remember the exact word)—to veneer the world with effete Anglicanism ; and the other day we were told by another candid friend that the whole doctrine of Church Defence was, “No Establishment, no Gospel.”

But it is more, I repeat, than a matter of words, even of the misuse of these two words, when there comes in a disloyal element under the mere cynical use of expressions that ought to be words of loyalty, of honourable history, of faithful affection, of creative experience, of great and comprehensive ideas of blessing, of privilege and duty. They who despise the words even to misuse, are one step from contempt of the meaning and obligation of the ideas that are in them. It is, then, not the misuse of the words, but the disloyalty that that misuse betrays, of which I am saying how painful and oppressive the thought of its prevalence is to me. Let me very briefly indeed—for I think that what I am going to say will not be any lesson to any of you—let me very briefly indicate what the nationality of the Church of England means ; for that is the idea that is endangered and misapprehended in the disloyalty of thought and expression.

Church of England's Claims.

The Church of England claims to be a portion of the Body of Christ—not by way of division or exclusion, but as a claim of real essential incorporation ; she does not say to people outside, You are not of the Body, but says to her own children that they are in the congregation of Christ's flock ; she believes in the work that Christ is doing by her, realises her position, and tries to do her duty. It is as so made members that we believe ourselves to be members incorporate of the mystical Body of Christ : our place and portion, our law of duty and belief, our relation to those around us, our families, parishes, and so on, they being partakers with us of the same incorporation. We are not outside this, and our realisation of the fact is expressed in the Saviour's words, "The kingdom is within you." We cannot look on the Body, by our membership of which we live, as if we were mere critics of something that was not a part of us and we of it. Anything like a faithful recognition of this would preclude a great deal of self-willed sectarian feeling in the Church : and it would tend to charity with them that are without, as well as to determination to try to do our own duty. And it is the want of this realisation that leads to the perversion of English Churchmen to other communities ; and I hesitate not to say this in reference to the very greatest of the men who in troubled times have deserted us.

Then this is the Church of our fathers ; the religious organisation by and through which not only has the grace of God worked life in us, but that by which the experience of history, doctrine, and discipline has made us what we are, or rather tried to make us what we ought to be. For it does not involve any undue respect to the doctrine of heredity or evolution if we believe that our religious life, in both internal and external aspects, has been largely moulded by the experience of the national Church and the Anglicanism, which has resulted from pre-reformation, and reformation, and reaction, and restoration, and renovation. It has helped to make us what we are, as it has tried to make us better.

We do not claim for it perfection, much less infallibility ; but it does claim from us loyalty and loving obedience, and earnest work to make better that which needs to be better, and to put away all that tends to confusion and disparagement. It requires of us true-heartedness, zeal, and sympathy ; and refusing them we condemn ourselves. For we have not chosen it, but it has chosen us, or rather our Lord has chosen us and our fathers through it, and will judge us as worthy or unworthy by the standard which He has so presented to us. We may, we ought to try to raise the standard, in love, in purity, in faith, in learning, in mission work, in all that tends to unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. For it is our own as we are His.

You may say, How can there be progress, raising of the standard, or development of good work, without recognition of what needs to be raised and developed ? It is true the very recognition of weakness is the first step towards the putting on strength ; but the pessimistic attitude is content with sneering at the weakness and at the idea of strengthening at all ; and in the shape of disloyalty it means desertion for some other form and fashion of belief and practice, the acceptance of which involves the renunciation of that on which the very claim to Christian liberty as a fact is based.

The Anglicanism in national Church history means a good deal if it means all this.

Of the word Establishment I need scarcely say so much. It means, of course, the national recognition of our Church as a Christian Church, as the representment of the religious life of the nation as historically worked out, and, by the means of property and discipline, enabled to discharge, so far as outward discharge can insure it, the effectual performance of the duties that membership of a Christian Church involves.

It means the national recognition of a system by which every inch of land in England, and every living soul in the population, is assigned to a ministration of help, teaching, advice, and comfort of religion ; a system in which every English man, woman, and child has a right to the

service of a clergyman, and to a home of spiritual life in the service of the Church. Of course, there are people to whom this means nothing, and will mean nothing until they find their need of it; and that time comes very often and very convincingly to many who have thought that it means nothing.

Surely, taken in conjunction with what I have said about nationality, this means a good deal: something that is worth defending—something the undervaluing of which means an undervaluing of privilege and work and duty, and a carelessness for those to whom the loss of such organisation of ministration, and of the security which recognition gives, means a loss of light, culture, and religious hope, and of all that depends civilly and socially on such influences.

And one word more: What are the aspirations, the hopes, ambitions, ideals of those who treat these things as matters to be scouted and thrown over? What the experiment for which we are to discard our experience and the advantage which we have found by it? Is it to be a dereliction of the duty that we owe to those who are now living in the influence of the faith and law we live by? That is no aspiration; the very thought of it is humiliation. Is it to be the emancipation from restrictions by which our life has been guided? Is it to be the codification and coercion of discipline over the freedom which is necessary for all meritorious or loyal compliance with law? Is it to be the relief of the priest from the secular responsibilities which are amongst the most important ways by which he is to help the sanctification of the world?

Party Words.

It is very painful, in the contemplation of these matters, to find the use of party watchwords increasing or persistently maintained, often by the actual perversion of meaning, too often by the real dislike of the ideas or modes of thought which are connected with the words so misapplied.

We know of old the force of the cry, "*Clericalism* is the

enemy," in a neighbouring country. We know the bugbear that *sacerdotalism* is in range of English society-supporting popular journals. We have experience of the power that the word *sectarianism* has in the mouths of ex-Cabinet ministers, and the charm that the fallacious "unsectarianism" has in meetings and discourses most undeniably sectarian. No cause or section of a party could conscientiously and comfortably acquiesce in the dictum that by such words they should be justified, and by such words they should be condemned. Great and miserable results have proceeded from the misuse of these and like forms. Clericalism is in France a stigma fatal to any proposal to which by any straining of language it can be applied; and that is to any scheme in which the idea of religious principle, as implying duty to God as well as man, can be detected. The charge of sacerdotalism has, I fear, proved fatal to the influence of many a good parish priest amongst people who attach very little intelligible meaning to the reproach; and it is not without its terrors for well-taught people also. An age fertile in the invention or appropriation of names to stigmatise any cause that it hates has heaped on this word of honour a very multitude of burdens. The advocate of religious education, the opponent of divorce and simony, the maintainer of the sanctity of Sunday, are all alike sacerdotalists: they may well endure to bear a more cruel stigma than this—but for a stigma it is meant. The cry of sectarianism is, as you know, at this moment, being used by people who would paralyse the exertions of those who are trying to secure the liberty of religious education, as we have it in the Catechism.

But it does not follow that the evils to which these three names are given do not in germ or in energy exist amongst us. There is a sectarianism which, in the maintenance of the cause of severance puts out of sight altogether the main purpose for which religious organisation exists. There is a clericalism which loses sight of the true work and character of the clergyman in the contemplation of his professional and class character;

there is a sacerdotalism which drags the most sacred things into the arena and through the mire of controversy : both seem to forget the interest of the flock for whose behoof men are made clerks and priests. There is a clericalism which determines all personal and social questions according to their bearing on clerical status ; there is a sacerdotalism which, unfortunately, has a charm for young and inexperienced men, who, in the consciousness of the nobility and responsibility of their calling, disparage and reject authority which they are sworn to obey, and discipline which in too great kindness spares them, and the duty of obedience which no amount of sacrifice can supersede, and above all, that love and service of the flock which nothing on earth, or in heaven either, can make less than the sum and substance of their service. It surely is a matter of severe remonstrance when one sees these things, by whatever name they are called, and in whatever party or section of party they are at work, corrupting the sincerity as well as destroying the usefulness of those whose meat and drink should be to do the will of Him that has called and sent them, and, after His own example, not to be ministered unto, but to minister—to Him for them, to them for Him—but in all relations, for the saving of those for whom He died.

May God take away from us the will to use, and the self-will that deserves the reproach of, bitter words.

FOURTH VISITATION CHARGE

MAY AND JUNE, 1899

THE third of the subjects to which I have referred as in a way standing over from the Visitation Charge of 1896, the question of the Unity of the Church and the correspondence on Anglican Orders, need not detain us longer than the mere note of dates and contents of letters. The question, so far as it is debatable, is for the present closed. I may remind you that in my charge of that year I went, at what probably struck my hearers as more than necessary length, into a statement of my own beliefs, principles, and anticipations. I adhere to that statement of beliefs and principles, and I think that the results have fulfilled my anticipations.

Pope's Encyclical.

The, Pope on June 20th, 1894, issued an Apostolic Epistle to all princes and peoples—the encyclical *Præclara*—urging them to take all means for the security and vindication of the Unity of the Church catholic, east and west, and all over the world. This was followed in 1895, on April 14th, by a letter to the English people—*Aman-tissimæ voluntatis*—inviting them to such unity as was conceivable in submission to the Roman Church; summarising the history of the conversion of England in the sixth and seventh centuries, the changes of the sixteenth and seventeenth, the devotion of great saints to the cause of recovery, and the necessary warnings against rationalism and materialism. This letter was a sort of application of

the teaching of the encyclical of the previous year; and, after urging prayer for reunion, and inviting co-operation in increased effort for it, added a special form of prayer to the blessed Virgin for her intercession for the dissident brethren and their admission into the true fold. When I gave my charge in 1896, another epistle was understood to be in preparation. This appeared on June 29th—an encyclic on unity—*Satis cognitum*—and was a much longer and more discursive document, for which, if it could have been read without the prejudice inseparable from the papal assumption, the whole Church might well have been thankful; but which, apart from this ground of vantage and drawback alike, would probably not have received much notice in our Church had it not been for the fact that, whilst it was in preparation, it was understood that investigations were being carried on at Rome on the subject of Anglican Orders. This was, I need not say, an old subject, which had been reopened in a fashion by a letter on the question written by M. Fernand Dalbus, in November, 1893, and apparently was regarded with much interest in ecclesiastical circles abroad. It is a subject on which I for one never for a moment expected that any new conclusions could be arrived at, or if arrived at on historical grounds could possibly be acknowledged.

Into the special circumstances of that investigation, how it originated, and how it was carried on, what additional evidences were adduced or rejected, I am quite unable to say. I believe that very contradictory statements have been made about this, and some very improbable assumptions started: it is possible that materials exist which may some day be forthcoming, that may throw light upon it. But I am, of course, in a position to say with authority that such investigation was never demanded, in any shape or way, by the Bishops or constitutional representatives of the Church of England; and that the curiosity, somewhat overrated and overstated, with which we looked for the result, was a curiosity as to materials and mode of treatment, much more than an anxiety about possible conclusions.

Whatever we may have looked for, or might have looked for, the silence of the intervening months was broken by the issue, on September 13th, 1896, of the apostolic letter *Apostolicæ curæ* on Anglican Ordinations. In this the discussion was practically closed and the papal decision announced. As you are aware, no doubt, the historical side of the question, of the transmission of Holy Orders, was set aside to all intents and purposes; and the rejection of Anglican Orders was based argumentatively on the assumption of the incompleteness of our doctrine of the priesthood in relation to the presbyterate and to the episcopate alike. Unfortunately, just at this moment, on October 11th, the Archbishop of Canterbury was called to his rest, whilst actually preparing memoranda and materials for a reply or acknowledgment of the letter *Apostolicæ curæ*. He left the task of answering to the Archbishop who succeeded him and his brother of York. And by them was drawn up the *Responsio*, the reply to the Pope, which appeared, in Latin and English, on February 19th, 1897.

This letter, which I would commend to your careful study for more than temporary reasons, contains a well-argued statement, on scriptural and historical grounds, of the theory of the priestly office, and a vindication of our Communion rite as affecting or affected by it. It was hoped that, for this age at least, the agitation of the question was set at rest, and that, to the great majority of English Churchmen, on the point at which the Pope's argument or assumption was aimed, the reply would be conclusive. But the weapon of controversy was soon taken up by Cardinal Vaughan and his Bishops, who in a *Vindication*, as it was called, of the papal letter, re-opened the discussion by an attack on our position from the side of sacramental doctrine, with especial regard to transubstantiation as an essential element in it. This matter was one which of course was not debatable by us, and seemed likely to those who broached it to afford them an easy triumph, somewhat perhaps after the fashion of the fallacy *plurium interrogationum*. The *Vindicatio*

was published early in January, 1898, and was answered by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in the following March. This answer, which is short and definitive, rejects the statement made in the *Vindicatio*, as to the claims of the Pope, protesting against the tone of it, especially in the assumption of a chaos existing wherever the authority of the Roman see is not acknowledged. The Archbishops decline to see in the *Vindicatio* any logical justification of the papal letter, or to recognise the validity of an argument on transubstantiation which was not contained in that letter. That argument places the discussion on ground on which our Church can and will admit of no variation of plea; it is impossible for us to believe that it is our Lord's will that the ministry of the Church should depend on a metaphysical definition, expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy. The claims of the Papacy must, then, be believed to be the great obstacle to unity.

With this reply the controversy, if it is a controversy, has reached its present phase. For us it is conclusive. I hope that my scanty outline of it may not have caused a waste of your time to-day. It seemed to me desirable to put the matter into continuous connection with what I have said in my former charges. It is not improbable that the whole correspondence, although it is somewhat difficult to follow, may be found to have a bearing on the other complications in which the present strife of parties have involved us; but the question of Unity and Orders is for the moment, outside of the popular view, except in the form of *Sacerdotalism*.

Education.

The perennial question of education by itself demands more discussion than I can undertake to give it now. But it is not one on the merits of which there can be much division of opinion among ourselves.

We all are committed to the belief that religious education, and that on the principles of the Church of England, is an indispensable requisite in our schools;

and I think further that we are agreed that the transfer of our Church elementary schools to School Boards, whilst the Cowper-Temple clause of 1870 is still in force, is, except the case of that dire necessity which knows no law, an act of disloyalty to the first principles of Churchmen.

And the difficulties of the present state of things are constantly before our minds; the competition between the two systems, the unlimited funds that are at the disposal of the rival agency, the political influences and feelings which more or less affect the theory and practice of elementary education; the impatience, the growing impatience, at the continuing, wearying struggle; the difficulties, pressed home in administration, of keeping up with the demands for extending and increasing efficiency, not to speak particularly of official, personal, and local antagonisms—of these there is no end.

It cannot be denied that a uniform system of schools and aids would be an enormous benefit, an enormous relief; it cannot be denied that such a benefit, such a relief, would be dearly bought at the cost of the sacrifice of religious teaching. It cannot be maintained that either the advocates of religious teaching, or the opponents of our system and principle, have brought within sight of probability any scheme for the organising of such teaching independent of the elementary school. I do not know whether I should be justified in saying that any Nonconformist community can be satisfied, to its own justification, with the teaching limited by the Cowper-Temple clause; but I am quite sure that no school of thinkers in the Church can be so satisfied, without some supplementary instruction, for which as yet no organisation is available or attainable. The Sunday-school teaching, depending largely on voluntary and untrained effort, and on voluntary and undisciplined attendance, cannot, with all its merits and approved benefits of good influence, pretend to be sufficient, nor does it. The result is that the Nonconformist who can satisfy himself with the board-school teaching gets his children taught at the public

expense, the Churchman does not. That, however, is an old story. . . .

On the question of secondary education, and the wider horizon that through it seems to be opening upon the educational administration generally, I need not venture to embark. It is not too much to hope that an acceptable scheme may be devised, which may make it not more difficult than it is now for the religious element to have its proper recognition. In manipulating the older scholastic institutions and their resources, as was done years ago, serious injustice, as many people think, was done to the Church; and in the development of anything like a general scheme, under national authority, but liable to be modified at every crisis by political factors, some adjustments should be possible which would not proscribe dogmatic teaching, in such a way as to lower the national apprehension of religious truth. But in these matters of adjustment and readjustment we find a very leisurely reaction after hasty reform; a tedious and ineffective sort of reaction which never goes far enough to restore the waste places, or build again what has been prematurely destroyed.

Clerical Poverty.

I wish that it ever were my good fortune to issue a Visitation Charge without having to recur to the grievous question of the increase of clerical poverty. It is increasing, and becoming more difficult to deal with as it increases. It is in its very nature depressing, weakening to the physical strength and spirits, distracting to the local and family energies, exhausting to the time and mental activity of those who are suffering, and so lowering even the standard and will of work. Little by little the amenities of the simplest life are decreasing; the demands for expenditure, in the agricultural parishes, of which this diocese is so largely constituted, are increasing; the means of education, such as the clergyman might reasonably expect for his children, are becoming more restricted, and the cost more difficult to meet. In that way, it is said, there is a resulting loss of promising labour in the supply

of candidates for ordination, a fact which perhaps affects other dioceses more than it does ours. The prospect, too, of providing for life insurance or provident assurance, or even for the retirement of the disabled clergy under the Pensions Act, is becoming more illusory than ever. The ways in which small incomes can be supplemented by tutorial or literary work are not at all satisfactory, and could not be made so if they were widely successful, as they are not. The difficulties of uniting small benefices with small populations are very serious—the parishioners are in almost every case strongly opposed to the plan, and the complications of the patronage are not easy to deal with. There are many livings overhoused, involving, as I know to my sorrow, dreadful anticipations of dilapidations, increasing need of repairs, and unnecessary expenditure in wages of servants. Whether in this point some relief might not be found if there were a legal possibility of leasing the large houses, or of treating them as general ecclesiastical rather than parochial property, manageable by the Ecclesiastical Commission, I dare not say; but one thinks that they might be so manipulated as to furnish a more manageable provision for the impoverished benefices. It is an economic question which I am not competent to ask or answer. I should be sorry to think that the alternative is to sell these houses at a dead loss, for in no case, I think, will the larger house sell for more money than it will take to build the smaller one: and the cases in which a happy arrangement of this sort has been made are few and far between.

It really seems that we have no resource but continued application to the owners of property, and congregations of the churches, who are in many cases suffering in the same way as the clergy for whom we ask their help. Many of the owners of land, I have no doubt, or I may say, I know, do much privately. Some, fewer than used to be found, of the clergy, are men of means who can even help their brethren; all, I am proud to say, except a marked and unhappy residuum, whose offence against honour and good taste is greater than poverty can excuse, do their

best to maintain spirit and work under the pressure. But the pressure is increasing.

One other good sign there is—and I mention it here because I do not mean to go into the curate question in my present charge. I do not think we have found it necessary in this diocese to economise the supply of curates. Comparing the Kalendar for 1899 with that of 1889, I find that the number of assistant curates has increased rather than diminished. It has varied in different places according to the age and necessities of incumbents, but in no case unaccountably. Curates, as we know, are not plentiful generally, but, whatever may be the rule about the difficulty of securing and retaining them, we have not been compelled to reduce the staff or the rate of remuneration. I wish that my Pastoral Letter obtained a heartier response and more money for spiritual help; but this consideration is not discouraging, just now.

Sustentation Fund.

Well, then, how about the Sustentation Fund?—the fund that in 1897 the laity were looking forward to the pleasure of sustaining, and for which in that year certainly large sums were raised, and very much larger hopes. You will remember our initial difficulties, and the reluctance which in the Diocesan Conference was expressed to adopt without modification the principles and method of the Central Queen Victoria Jubilee Fund. I am happy to say that last year we arrived at a modified agreement with the Central Agency, and that now we are able to work with it, and to benefit by it, without risking damage to our own plan of augmenting benefices and helping poor parishes and poor clergy.

I hope that I need not now urge upon clergy and churchwardens the necessity of supporting the plan, and of doing it without loss to the other charitable work, local, diocesan, or general. But we must not, we do not, expect too much, or for a moment regard this agency as exonerating us from any portion of our private or public duties of contribution.

The Spiritual Character of the Church of England.

It may be quite unnecessary, but in the present state of the religious atmosphere it may be quite necessary, for me to say that, in what I am going to say, I am going to address you as men who have a thorough and earnest and honest belief in the essential spiritual character of the Church of England, as being, in God's contemplation and in the experience of human history, so far as we can read either of them, a living, springing, connected, and rightly developed member of the great body of the Catholic Church, the Body of Christ. I shall not go over again the statement of principles which I have put before you in my earlier Charges, nor yet the distinctive points which, without any exclusion or ignoring of the claims of other religious bodies, I have, on the testimony of our continuous history, and the declarations of our symbolical books, claimed as marking our position as the Catholic Church in and for England, the national wing of the great Catholic Army of Christ. I say without exclusion, for I am well aware of the claims which other communities, beside the Church of Rome, advance to oust us from our title, and of the objections that are made to our claim of continuity and catholicity, and even of corporeity at all, as distinguished from the idea of Establishment and the Christian state. It is the affirmation of our claim, not the exclusion of their competition, on which I insist. And I am aware of the singular concordat between Roman and Puritan controversialists, who agree in nothing much besides, to maintain the theory that the Church of England is the creation of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, as neither representing the religious life of the land in its corporate organisation, nor constituted by a continuous succession of faith, discipline, and orders from the earliest Christianity of England, and the Catholic and Apostolic body from which that Christianity came; which reaches back to the Upper Chamber of the first Easter, and the bodily presence of the risen Lord, to the parting command to baptise all nations, and the promise of the continued presence even to the end of the world. I repeat my own conviction, and

I trust that I have your sympathy and fellowship of belief. So I do not bring in question the rights, liberties, and experiences of other communities, which have taken other ways than ours of approaching our common Father and Lord ; or the working in and through them of the self-same Spirit ; or the shining on and in them of the true light that lighteth every man that is born into this world. I do not question the reality of their prayers, or the validity of the rites which they substitute for our sacraments. But I speak to you, as to men who realise affirmatively and constructively what you profess to believe.

Thus, then, I do not repeat the arguments of former years ; rather, as I said, I must take it for granted that, in what I affirm, I may appeal to your acceptance of the first principles of belief. I daresay that some people outside will say that all this is mere sacerdotalism, and that I am trying to entangle you in admission of the same theories. But I do not think that we need mind that very much. Some points of difficulty must be treated with particular notice, but I shall not attempt an exhaustive, or even a connected treatment of our whole counsel. So much be understood.

This may be a solemn prelude to what may strike some of you as a commonplace Charge—but I let it stand, because it is true to me, and, I trust, true to you, and there is nothing, high or low, in the matters that I have to speak to you about, that we can afford to debate in reference to a lower standard.

The "Crisis."

You will expect me, and justly, to speak now about what is called the crisis, the present crisis in Church affairs. I do not mean to say that it is not a crisis, for every day's work involves a crisis, every moment a trial, every morning a visit of judgment. I do not think that it is essentially a crisis determining the defeat or victory of parties, or the relations of Church and State ; but it certainly is a crisis for victory between the moral forces of charity and in-

tolerance, hatred and love, obstinate wrongheadedness and intolerant assumption, the spirit of controversy and the spirit of peace—Christian civilisation and unchristian barbarism. Hard words! let him that is without sin cast the first stone.

In looking, in a more special way, to the circumstances that are connected with this crisis, it may be well briefly to set in order the series of events which, during the last year and a half, have followed one another rapidly and confusedly. Anyhow, this arrangement will help us to discriminate the several points on which, in a Charge like this, it will be convenient for me to touch.

Trouble began with the outcry about additional services and ceremonies adopted in some few churches in London and the neighbourhood, which, not being provided in the Prayer Book, and having neither traditional authority as survivals, logical consistency with the legal ritual, nor special recognition by the Bishops, were startling to religious people in general, were attacked in a tumultuary manner by certain agencies which it is not necessary for me to characterise, and were defended by their supporters, in resolute manifestoes and elaborate arguments, with which I, happily, am not called upon to deal.

A little later arose what I must call a second outcry against the Bishops as a body, who might, it was asserted, have stopped the offensive ritual if they had been awake and active in doing their duty; and who, not having done it, were guilty of laches, and even perversion and frustration of justice, by putting, it was asserted, obstacles in the way of ecclesiastical litigation. This complaint was largely ventilated in newspaper articles, and letters, signed and anonymous, in which the policy and honesty of the Bishops were openly and unreservedly challenged; a method which, it is scarcely too much to say, was calculated absolutely to defeat the object which was supposed to be aimed at; weakening the machinery by which the remedies might possibly have been worked. The excitement thus produced had the effect of stimulating resistance amongst the clergy and congregations implicated in the services

attacked, and producing some sadly strained relations between them and the Bishops, whose great offence to the attacking party was the way in which the extravagances had been overlooked or condoned.

Coincidentally with this arose, not unnaturally, a demand for the reform of ecclesiastical courts, of courts in which ecclesiastical questions are debated and decided; urged from the side of the agitators with the view or compelling the Bishops to vigorous action; supported with some vehemence by the other side, as necessary for the restoration of a jurisdiction which they could conscientiously regard as authoritative, but which at present appears to them to be unconstitutionally dealt with on the side of the Crown; and seriously taken into consideration by the Bishops themselves. This question of reform, of course, has been discussed, in somewhat illogical and very violent contravention, by the party of high ritual, whose action in contesting the capacity and competency of the present judicial system, urging the validity of the old Canon Law and the necessity of reviving purely spiritual courts, has its counterbalance in the determination of the other party to aim at nothing less than the total abolition of the ecclesiastical element in jurisdiction. This conflict not improbably represents the finally obstructive element in all plans of pacification.

Less technically, as a part of a programme, but really and vitally a measure of tactic, emerged a series of literary, argumentative, and historical onslaughts on the position of the High Church party, especially as connected with the Oxford Movement, and the men, schools, and ecclesiastical propensions assumed to influence men and schools, and especially the present episcopate.

And, lastly, on this array of opposite forces and principles has been developed an attack, along the whole line, upon the Church of England and its character, history, policy, discipline, order, and ritual, in which some of the Non-conformists and some Roman Catholic advocates have joined, with a certain inclination to raise the question of Disestablishment. This attack has been promoted by

public meetings, arguments in both Houses of Parliament, an elaborate association of inquisitory and propagandist agencies; by the circulation of violent controversial pamphlets, and by personalities of a character that had seemed to have worked itself out in the *mêlée* of the age of the Reformation. And in this we now are.

I hope that, in this short review of the course of our adventures since 1897, I have succeeded in marking out the several topics which, more or less briefly and tediously, I shall notice in the course of this Charge.

Additional Services.

I will take first the question of additional services, on which the earliest discussion of any special importance arose, although that discussion did not very much affect this diocese except in the way of stimulating public attention to what are called ritual extravagances. I construe the name *additional services* to denote services not prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, or authorised by the Bishop of the diocese under the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872. Following the example of some of my brother Bishops, I issued in October last a letter to the clergy of the diocese inquiring what services, if any, outside that limit were held in their churches.

To that inquiry I have had a great number of answers. In 511 churches out of 650 (speaking roundly) I am informed that there are no such extra or additional services; but this statement must not be regarded as exactly an answer to the question, for in a great proportion of them, Harvest Festival Services, Special Mission Services, Intercession for Missions, Church of England Temperance Society Services, Girls' Friendly and Mothers' Union Services, are so customary as to be practically to be authorised, even without special sanction at each recurrence. And the same may be said of the Three Hours' Services on Good Friday, which contain nothing in the way of formal prayer that is not in the Prayer Book. All these are very common. I should be sorry to think it otherwise, for although I cannot always consider multiplica-

tion of services as a mark of discreet and zealous labour, I cannot say that I wish the use of the churches to be limited to the regular Sunday and Saints' Day Services, even when supplemented by the proper daily Mattins and Evensong. However, as nearly as I can calculate, there are in the diocese between five and six hundred churches in which no service is used which is not prescribed by the Prayer Book, or does not come within the terms of the Act of 1872, except so far as the explicit sanction of the Diocesan has been in cases dispensed with as unnecessary.

Of the remaining returns to my circular, some call for special notice, and some for very brief mention. I shall make my remarks, however, general. Where it is necessary for me to localise a variation, I shall deal with it privately. It appears that, in some dozen churches, Lantern Services, as they are called, have been held; probably without any serious departure, as to the use of unauthorised forms, from the rule already stated. I am very sorry for this; it has been done without my expressed leave, and without my approval. These Lantern Exhibitions are in place in schools or mission rooms, but the church is not the proper place for them, even as adjuncts to Divine service; nor do I think that the argument that in church the solemn pictures exhibited, and the words spoken in reference to them, will be treated more solemnly or with more devotion, or with less irreverence, for that it is what it comes to, than they would be in school, is a valid argument in their favour. Prayers may be reasonably made an accompaniment of the exhibition in schools, and with possibly more freedom than could be in any circumstances sanctioned in church. And order might be as easily and reasonably enforced. But if these are to be sanctioned and become common, it is hard to say where the development of the irregularity can be stopped. Certainly there would be great difficulty in objecting to processions to Stations of the Cross, if Lantern Services were recognised, and as I cannot see how the former can be freed from objection, I infer that the objection runs against the other. This, which is perhaps the

smallest of the exceptional points, I shall not dwell on further.

The following points are incidentally serious, but not, as it seems to me, in themselves of very great importance:—

(a) Collects

The substitution of Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, on certain days, especially black letter Saints' Days, and most especially on the festivals of the Blessed Virgin, for the ordinary Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the week. This is objectionable, not so much because of anything that would be fairly open to misunderstanding in the forms used, but because of the entire absence of authority for departure from the order of the Church, and the consequent opening made for use in the Collects of language irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Church; as, for instance, in invocation, or in prayer for the acceptance of the mediation of the saints. I am aware that the use of these is not uncommon in the chapels of some of the communities, and that the use of the appropriate Gospels and Epistles is defensible as sanctioned or recognised by Bishops where it has been asked. But I have never agreed to sanction such Collects myself, even when and where they are quite innocent. These must not be used at all in parish churches or public services. There are very few cases in which such a practice is returned, but they deserve a certain modicum of censure.

(b) Stations of the Cross.

The use of special processional services in connexion with the Stations of the Cross. This may be quite in-offensive, if the prayers be taken from the Book of Common Prayer, and if special sanction is given; but I do not think that the practice should be encouraged, as it is distinctly one that has no recognition at all in our legal and canonical worship, and is open to very unkind criticism, to which we ought not to subject the holy things, scenes of events, and representation of acts that we profess to venerate. The erection of the pictures or sculptures of the Stations

of the Cross ought never to be attempted without the authority of a faculty.

(c) Blessing of Palms.

A like caution, if you will please to consider it one, will apply to the blessing and presenting of palms on Palm Sunday, if it be done in church. There is nothing superstitious in this, but if it is to be done, it had better be done outside.

(d) Guild Services.

The special forms of Guild Services, including processions, Guild Collects, and other little ceremonies, to which objection could only be made on the ground of frivolity, are another head. There are, however, a large number of such Guilds in the towns, some of them using Collects in which the Blessed Virgin and the Saints are mentioned, and which are tinged with a sort of superstition that is quite irreconcilable with the teaching of the Church. I will not specify them particularly, as I have mentioned under the first head the obvious objection to their legality, and I think that they are alike unfitted for private and public use. This may strike you as severe, especially considering the variety of local uses, but I should be glad not to be called upon to refuse or to grant sanction to many of the local manuals, as well as to the more ambitious attempts at general collections of such forms.

The following points are of more importance, and I would wish to impress upon you very strongly the need of discreet and cautious action in any approach which you may wish to make to quite justifiable acts and offices which lie under serious objections on other grounds:—

(e) Prayers for the Dead.

The use of Services for the Dead. I observe in the returns made to me from some ten churches, notices of services under the name of Vespers for the Dead, and for special observance of All Souls' Day. I am not going to

lay down any principle about prayers for the dead. I believe that it is legally recognised that to pray for the dead is not forbidden in the Church of England: the idea recommends itself very strongly to the hearts and affections of a great number of good Christian people. Prayers for the dead are not open to exoteric objection, for as we know nothing whatever about the exact condition of the departed until the day of judgment, and cannot dream of limiting by our ignorance the possible action of the Lord of life regarding them, there is nothing conceivably to be objected to the addressing the Almighty Lord in whose hands they are, in prayers to which He will assuredly give such weight as they may deserve. In all such contemplations we are too prone to judge of the things unseen by the things that we see and know, and to look at the action of the Almighty as somehow conditioned by our own powers of sight and understanding. Services in memory of the departed are very common, and becoming still more so; and, indeed, whenever we pray that we ourselves may meet again with those whom we have loved and lost, do we not pray for the dead? But it must not be forgotten that in the mediæval Church the practice was closely connected with that usage of celebration of Masses for the Dead, on which our Church, in the Thirty-first Article, has passed the severest sentence of condemnation that she has ever passed on any Roman abuse.

I most earnestly hope that those of the clergy who desire to use their legal freedom in this matter will use it legally, and strictly confine themselves to the language of the Prayer Book, which is amply sufficient for public utterances offered to Him who heareth the prayer.

Holy Communion.

On the various, few but various, departures from the regular practice of the Church in connexion with the Holy Communion, which are reported to me, and which do not properly come under the head of additional services, I had better say what little it is necessary for me to say now. You will, I hope, remember the strong cautions which in

former years I have given you about certain practices connected with the Blessed Sacrament. I have censured, and would again in express terms censure most definitely:—

(1) The practice of celebrating where only the priest or a colourable quota of communicants participate in the communion. Where this is done I consider that the show of ceremony and elaboration of music add to the various objections which the practice seems to me to deserve.

(2) The use of attitudes and postures which may without unreasonably captious suspicion be regarded as committing the worshipper to that form of Roman error, in transubstantiation, against which our own Church has continuously and unwaveringly protested.

(3) The practice of bringing children, not confirmed, to see the celebration, either as a lesson, or as a part of regular worship in substitution for the morning prayers which are the family portion of English Church-men and -women.

(4) The question of reservation, about which I need not now speak particularly.

Corpus Christi.

On all these points you know my mind, and what weight my censure is likely to have with you. I cannot forbid you to do what it is beyond my power to prevent, nor shall I enjoin on you the doing of things that you have a right and discretion to refuse to do. But I will mention one more in particular; the special devotions, occasionally returned, for Corpus Christi Day, and the use of language in connexion with the celebration of that day which cannot be countenanced in the Church of England. I am very sensible that the ceremonies performed in foreign countries on that day have something attractive to some sorts of English people, who see in them, perhaps on their summer holiday, the first remarkable exhibition of devotion in the new country. It is a beautiful sight in itself, and indeed it is very impressive as an assertion of religious life and belief, very often seen amongst, and tolerated by the people of a country whose ruling powers only recognise divine teaching on very rare occasions. But without bring-

ing against the simple people who make a great function of it the charge of unreality or of superstition, we must say that it is a ceremony which will not bear analysis, and is from every point of view open to the most destructive criticism, historical and theological. It can never commend itself to the English nation, and to attempt to copy it is to drag the Holy Sacrament through the mire of ignorant scoffing, and still viler comment from people who, without being exactly ignorant, cannot refrain from the criticism which injures both themselves and the people they criticise.

Preparation for Holy Communion.

Another point is this. I see that in the list of additional services there are occasionally included uses of communicant and children's services in preparation for Holy Communion, and that classes are held in church in some places with special prayers and special forms of general confession. I must say that this seems to me a matter for special caution. Public self-examination, in the form of question put by the priest, and collective or individual reply made by the members of the class, is a thing which only a very careful and experienced clergyman is qualified to manage. It is open to two objections, (1) that of entire unreality, and (2) that of unadvisable suggestion, both of them objections which tell so seriously against the methods of private confession. What I have to say generally about that I shall come to presently ; now I confine myself to the caution to be observed in the use of numerous manuals, which seem to be put into the hands of communicants and candidates, only a very few of which can be said to be free from the risk of misuse and misinterpretation, as well as from the tendency to morbid feeling and the stimulus to unwholesome curiosity.

Books of Devotion.

One thing more : in the use of books of special devotions there are frequently brought into the language of prayer and praise terms which are quite out of harmony with the idea of public, united, and reasonable service.

This mischief is not peculiar to any school in the Church or any community of Christians—it is very common in all sections of revivalism of evangelistic agencies, even of such steady religious bodies as the Moravians, as well as in the Church of Rome. There is a special temptation to it apparently in Mission Services. There are many terms of address to our Lord and to the Almighty Father, and even to the Holy Ghost, which are irreverent in themselves, and only to be extenuated as the language of an enthusiasm which does not pervade ordinary congregations even of the most devout people. Such cries, for instance, to our Lord as "Sweet Jesu," or "Prince of the Catholic Church," even if fortified by the authority of Jeremy Taylor, do not carry a reality to the ears of English people, and if they have no real meaning they are worse than irreverent.

Here I will close my review. I hope that I have not seriously hurt the feelings of any who have heard me. I think that I have given to the matter as much time and attention as, in this diocese, it demands. For without any Pharisaism I may be thankful that so little that is difficult of treatment in these respects has emerged in this diocese, and I heartily thank the clergy and laity alike who have helped to keep us at peace when so many of our neighbours have been at war. May God continue that peace to us, and help those who have worked in discreet, sympathetic, progressive ways towards the accomplishment of His good purpose. I thank all you who have helped towards this end with the most sincere gratitude that my heart is capable of.

The "Mass."

I would beg the clergy to abstain from using the word Mass for the service of celebrating the Holy Sacrament.

The word Mass signifies that form of celebration which is proper to the Roman and unreformed Church of the West. It may or may not be the best form, the true Catholic form, the most perfect form ; but the word means not the Sacrament, but the service of celebration.

The service of our own Church contains all that is necessary for the complete celebration, but in form and ritual it is not the same as the Roman.

Nothing in this distinction ought to be interpreted as affecting the validity, authenticity, or efficiency of either rite. We humbly trust that wherever, by those who believe the Lord's word, desire His promise, and obey His command, that which is done is done in remembrance of Him, the Sacrament is duly celebrated, and its efficacy guaranteed by the great promise of the Saviour Himself. But however that may be, and however much we may be inclined to the supposition that it is according to the measure and kind of their faith that the grace is given—it is not for us to limit the action of divine love by the ignorance of those who appeal to it, or by the diversity of interpretations of those who seek, in sincerity and humility, more perfect experience of the blessing, the blessing of the gift itself more than they can understand, or desire, or deserve.

But to use the name that belongs to one particular form of rite for another form which, in all matters of form except the repetition of the words of Institution, is distinct from it, is not only inconsistent, but incompatible with truth. And when and where it is done, either with an intention of promoting discord, or with a wish to conceal difference of opinion and belief, it is altogether to be discountenanced. Whether it is thus used to disguise differences of detail, or of faith, to give colour to an unreal claim of uniformity; or whether it is used to accentuate differences of detail so as to provoke charges of fundamental division between schools and sections of the Church, is to be condemned. And the wanton misuse of it in applying it to our order of Holy Communion is very strongly to be condemned. The Reformers in the first Prayer Book retained the word, but when they realised the state of the case they gave it up. Even if the "Mass" were identical with the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, the use of the name would be offensive—but as certainly it is not, it is false and suggestive of more falsehood and more insincerity. Of

the silliness of this I prefer not to speak. On this point I would peremptorily insist ; and would forbid the employment of the term absolutely, were I not apprehensive that those who are so foolish as to use it would not be wise enough to obey my injunction.

Confession.

And here I will put in a few words that I have to speak about Confession — words which I have said or written often before to-day, but which will help us to complete our present review of existing difficulties, and which I will beg of you to take as they stand, reading nothing between the lines.

It is quite clear that the Church of England regards the confession of sin as a most important part of her religious system. In both Morning and Evening Prayer, in the office of Holy Communion, and in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, and in the Communion Service for Ash Wednesday, she has set before her children the necessity for the confession of sin. She has, in each place, asserted for her ministers the authority to pronounce to the penitent her Lord's message of absolution, and in the Ordination of Priests, in the most solemn words uttered at the moment of the laying on of hands, she claims for them their share in the great commission which our Lord gave to His apostles : " Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." These things cannot be gainsaid. She has likewise authorised her members to have recourse in certain cases, where anyone cannot, by confession to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment and present undoing of wrong and reconciliation with his neighbours, quiet his own conscience herein, but requires further comfort and counsel to have recourse to the parish priest, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and " open his grief ; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

This recommendation, it must be observed, is for the benefit of persons qualified to receive the Holy Sacrament, and kept back by a consciousness of unworthiness. It cannot, then, be honestly pressed into the argument for making confession a part of the discipline of the unconfirmed, or of preparation for Confirmation.

But the Church has not, by any minute regulations, defined the occasions or methods of the proceeding, thus leaving a certain amount of liberty and discretion to the person who is encouraged to adopt it. Nor has she anywhere formulated an authoritative discipline of the kind, or authorised her clergy to impose such discipline as part of her ordinary system of working. She does, on the other hand, insist in the strongest way, both in the Communion Service and in the Catechism, on self-examination as a part of the preparation for the Holy Communion. A clergyman, then, is not justified by our Prayer Book in imposing confession on the young in preparation for Confirmation or first Communion; and if, in the manuals used for self-examination in communicant classes or other, any direction is to be found that implies the obligation of specific or particular confession as necessary, or that recommends minute or suggestive examination by the clergyman before the giving of absolution, I should strongly advise the disuse of such compilations.

I know, and you know, that there are considerable differences of opinion among clergyman of discretion, zeal, and experience, as to how this matter should be dealt with, and whether the regular habit of confession and absolution, limited by the words of the Church, can be wisely encouraged. I have, personally speaking, always believed that such a regular practice is rather depreciating than helpful to the spiritual sense and to the reality of moral responsibility, weakening to the religious character accordingly, and to the unreserved and immediate sense of approach to God. And, accordingly, I should strongly protest against the idea of making it a part of the regular discipline of religious life, against pressing it in any but exceptional cases where exceptional remedies are

necessary. But I am well aware that the contrary opinion is maintained and strongly maintained by many men of far greater knowledge and experience than has ever come into my life; whilst I see most clearly the danger, and protest most emphatically against the practice of allowing the ministration to be put or left in the hands of young and untried men. But when I say this I say it with a very strong protest against the strange outcry on the subject which we are hearing to-day. I do not believe in the corrupting power or efforts of the good men who are using this as a means of blessing. I do not for a moment believe that the nations or communities that practise it lose dignity or consciousness of duty and liberty by it. I do not for a moment believe that the clergy of the Church of England are not to be trusted with the administration of it, or that they are more tempted than any others to make a wrong use of it. I do not believe that in ordinary cases (and except where there is criminal suggestion, the cases are ordinary) a young boy or girl would be brought by confession into closer acquaintance with sin and vice than by reading the police reports in the newspapers, or the many amusing books in which vice of one sort or another constitutes the dominant note of the recital. But I cannot help feeling that the excitement which at this moment is being raised about the question, critical as it is, and unquestionably sincere as it is amongst large classes of people, does contain certain elements of unreality: it is so easy and pleasant to repent of other people's sins, and to expose the fallacy of other people's beliefs, especially when you neither love nor like them; and it is a very tempting thing for people to use for party purposes, agencies and influences, which can, by the very fact of their own ignorance, be manipulated for ends of which they are not conscious. And it is an easy thing to accuse the Ministry of the Word of complicity in the very mischiefs which it was framed, and is working, sometimes, perhaps, in unwise and hazardous ways, but really and earnestly working to prevent or to dispel or to remedy. Surely evil imaginations are a shame to any cause, and

cowardly insinuations, vile imputations of corrupt intent, are weapons which may not in this world recoil on those who use them, but not the less, as St. James says of the abuse of the power of speech, defile the whole body, and set on fire the course of nature and are set on fire of hell. No one can read the leaflets or look at the caricatures now circulated on this subject without detecting a spirit that deserves such condemnation.

The Bishops.

I turn now to the indictment against the Bishops, in which the whole burden of responsibility for troubles, actual and hypothetical, new and old, is laid upon us of the present day, either as our personal fault, or as an inheritance which we have aggravated rather than exerted ourselves to remedy. You will remember the ways in which these serious charges have been made ; they are written so that he may run who reads them, and they are circulated with such elaborate and penetrating urgency that scarcely the most insignificant household in the country can evade the reception of them. The offence of each diocese and of each clergyman in it is laid first on the Bishop of the diocese, and then on all of us together, with just a little rebate for the reproach of the minister who appointed us. Our silence and our utterance are alike set to our discredit ; we are as bad when we are awake as when we are asleep ; but our wakefulness or our sleepiness depends on the opinion of the friends who watch over us ; we are credited with the misuse of the powers we have not, and with neglect to use the powers we have. Every man who can write, can write to the newspapers and call us to account individually and collectively ; our office as well as our discharge of its duties is an imposture—we are the servants, the paid servants of the laity—the best paid and most pretentious branch of the Civil Service—false to our masters, false to our work, or even to our own low idea of the way in which it should be done. I think the waste-paper baskets of the age of the Reformation and of the Rebellion must have been ransacked for lines and methods of vituperation.

The writers and circulators of these criticisms know very little about us: if they have personal acquaintance with a single Bishop he is almost invariably made the happy exception to the general censure; they have very little knowledge indeed of the order of our lives; if by chance they know anything of anyone, he is pretty sure to be what they call overworked; all the rest are overpaid; he is overburdened with confirmations and ordinations, and perhaps deserves to be set free from such routine, that he may devote himself to the defence of certain principles, and the discipline of certain clergymen through whom he is himself adroitly attacked. What we do is done wrong, what we do not do is supplied for us by still more telling hypothesis.

And what does it all come to? We are unprofitable servants, no doubt. We are the servants of the servants of God, who have a right to find fault with us: who doubts it? A Bishop with a quiet conscience must indeed be a very unprofitable servant; but there are ways of realising it, and ways of bringing home to us the reality of it. The danger to us is that the constant bearing of reproaches which we do not deserve may sometimes harden or blind us in respect of shortcomings which are not so open beforehand, but which are far more real hindrances to our work, and more inexcusable at the bar of awakened conscience.

But I must go further than this admonition to myself and my brethren. I will protest. Our first duty is to build up, to strengthen, as by God's grace we may, the agency for the working of the Gospel; to guard, to develop, to direct sound work; to know our people, and set them an example of loyalty and industry. It is not our sole duty to repress what needs repression; it is our first duty to promote what needs sustaining, to help what needs help; to direct the zeal that needs direction, to stimulate the energy that needs urging, to check and to train, not merely to pluck up and to destroy.

Of course, as officers of the Lord's host, we are bound to the repression of treachery, disloyalty, and cowardice, but it is that we may stand in the gap in the day of battle.

So I say, I cannot recognise the notion that the Bishop is a mere suspector—the *Episcopus* is not *hyposcopus*, if I may coin a word. I will not devote the best part of my time and ability to the work of a detective. I will not myself, nor will I allow my officers to make the opportunities of worshipping God opportunities of spying out faults; I will not profane the sacrament by watching for occasions of offence. I will make my visitations legally, not as an inquisitor. I will hear complaints, and I will do my best to remedy them; but I will not invite them, and I will test their genuineness or their factitiousness—factitiousness—before I act on them. I will keep my eyes open to mistakes, that I may try to anticipate them, to prevent them: but I will not provoke resistance or stimulate reaction as reaction. When they come before me, I will judge them fairly. Where allowances have to be made, I will balance the reasons for or against allowance. I will not encourage neglect of duty on the plea of any amount of zeal; nor extenuate disloyalty for any elevation of ideal, or any amount of provocation. But I will not take the law and rule of my episcopal administration from the dictation of men or parties who deny alike my official right and my spiritual competency, however much I may or must acquiesce in the sentence of condemnation for my personal disqualifications.

Tall talk all this! and it is perhaps amusing to be told that I am waking up to the true state of affairs, when it is the critics who are just awaking to the fact that they have misjudged me. But it is not less amusing to find their language agreeing almost literally with the objurgations hurled by Pope Gregory XI. against the Archbishop and Bishops of England for not persecuting Wickliffe and his followers in 1377.¹ It is a bit of the old leaven derived by the Puritans from the Papists; powerful and lasting in its

¹ “De quibus sic subortis et non extirpatis, seu saltem eis nulla facta resistentia quam scimus, sed transactis seu toleratis, conniventibus oculis vos aliquae praesules Angliae, cum debeatis esse columpnae ecclesiae dictaeque fidei defensores attenti, conniventibus oculis tam negligenter transeundo, non immerito deberetis rubore perfundi, verecundari et in propriis conscientiis remorderi.”—xi. Kal. Jun. 1377.

effects, but after all one of the class of curses that come home to roost.

I have not to learn my duty : I trust in my Lord to help me to do it. I flatly deny that I have neglected it ; and you will testify for me.

Church Government.

The next point arises out of this. If as Bishops we are incompetent and incapable, and if the machinery of our jurisdiction, whatever may be the basis of it, is all at sixes and sevens, what can be done to set matters right?

There are two theories to begin with ; one that there should be a reform of the courts of spiritual jurisdiction directed to secure the supremacy of the secular authority ; the other that there should be a reversion to a system, somewhat ideal in its historic aspect, by which all spiritual causes should be determined by spiritual law, and by the authority of spiritual persons only. I put the extreme views barely in opposition to one another.

The questions connected with this conflict of opinion are not new to me, as I need hardly tell you. The Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts which sat from 1881 to 1883 has left a vivid impression on my memory in more ways than one ; and all that I learned in the work of that Commission, and have learned since, has strengthened my convictions, expressed again and again, in divers forms and places, of the irreconcilableness of the irreconcilable.

I cannot go into details about this. Let me put before you one or two simple points—elementary points, you will see, they are.

There seem to be seven points to be counted on :

1. The sovereign power that creates the Court and gives the jurisdiction.
2. The Court itself, its composition and qualification.
3. The definition of the point which is to be decided (*contestatio litis*).
4. The declaration of the law which is to be applied.
5. The proof or disproof of the charges.

6. The determination of the sentence.

7. The enforcement or execution of the sentence.

Setting aside for the moment the authority that creates the Court : (1) we see that in every case of litigation there must be an authority to decide what is to be done in the case, and a law to decide how that authority is to determine on its decision. I do not mean to include in this the question of the array of facts, which may in any case be determined by jury or otherwise on evidence, but to distinguish between the position and character of the judge and the law which is to determine his judgment.

And (2) in every case of litigation a power is required (*a*) to determine and (*b*) to enforce the decision. Or we may put it : (*a*) There is an authority that establishes the jurisdiction ; (*b*) there is a Court to determine the judgment ; (*c*) there is a law to instruct and bind the Court ; (*d*) there is an authority to execute the sentence. Is there any way of getting these functions discharged by a duplex machinery ?

It is said the State or the Crown must be in all cases the constituting authority by which the Court acts ; the Church must, in all cases of spiritual litigation, be the authority which declares the law ; and again, it is said that the Church must both be the constituting authority of the Court, and declare the law that determines the sentence ; and again, it is said that the secular arm in the constitution shall both constitute the Court and declare the law ; and further it is said that as the secular law must, for it alone can, enforce and execute the sentence, it must also have the right to review and to refuse to execute it.

I am not putting these matters to you as a lawyer, but in such a way that you may prepare yourselves to see that there are difficulties on both sides. In this I have the advantage of the lawyer, whose training (as Oliver Wendell Holmes has told us) is the best possible training in the world to enable a man to see one side of a subject. I am trying roughly to state two or three.

To repeat once more : (1) The Crown may both create

the Court and declare the law ; (2) the Church may both create the Court and declare the law ; (3) the Crown may create the Court and the Church declare the law ; (4) the Church may create the Court and the Crown declare the law, as having the responsibility of enforcing the law.

Instances may illustrate these conditions or some of them: *e.g.* (1) In the Court of High Commission the Crown practically did both ; (2) in the mediæval courts, whilst excommunication and other ecclesiastical penalties retained their hold on men's consciences, the Church did both ; (3) in the action of the Court of Delegates (from the Reformation to 1832) the Crown created the Court, and the Church by its officers was answerable for the law ; and (4) when the sentences of excommunication required enforcement by the secular arm, the last combination was up to a certain point realised. Again, as I have said, this is a very rough arrangement, and, in each of the four alternatives, in practical working some modifications are necessary.

It is sufficiently obvious that for the working of any duplex theory, some concordat, historically developed or definitively established, must be in force between Church and State. I will therefore now read to you seventeen brief statements of the relations between the two powers as touching these matters, which I put before the Courts Commission in 1882, and with a view to which, I am fully persuaded, all attempts to reconcile the parties which you know are in conflict on the subject must be made: however little hope or anticipation I may have that they will be so made.

1. The State has the power and a right to endow and disendow any religious body, and to prescribe the terms under which endowments shall be held, and to provide and modify the machinery for securing that those terms shall be observed by the religious body so endowed, and to withdraw the endowments if the terms are not kept, or if, for other reasons, it seems to the State expedient or necessary to withdraw them.

2. The State is the source of all coercive jurisdiction,

and, where it allows such jurisdiction to be exercised, has a right to prescribe the terms on which it is to be retained, and to examine into the way in which it is exercised.

3. The Church of England is a religious body, with distinct principles of belief and constitution, and a certain relation to historical and Catholic Christianity, which it cannot alter or part with without forfeiting its essential character; and which the State, so long as it deals with the Church as a corporate institution, recognises as integral and consistent with the terms on which it so deals, either by suffering it to hold property or to exercise a coercive jurisdiction.

4. The Church has, as a part of its essential constitution, the right to declare the law in matters of faith and spiritual discipline, to try spiritual causes, and to pronounce spiritual censures; but she has no coercive jurisdiction except by the gift and permission of the State, and even spiritual censures may, when they involve temporal consequences, be restrained by the civil power.

5. By the Church of England it is to be understood the clergy and the laity, who are habitually sharers in the sacraments and other ordinances, and who have not, by any act of disobedience or schism, separated themselves from her communion.

6. The clergy have their share in securing and maintaining the constitution of the Church by their efficient service in spiritual matters, by their discharge of the office of teachers, by their cultivation of theological learning, by their voice in the Convocations, and by the fact that Ecclesiastical Magistracy is or should be exercised by the spiritual hierarchy.

7. The laity have their share in securing and maintaining the constitution of the Church by their influence in the State, by their voice in Parliament, by their possession of patronage, and by the influence they possess, according to existing arrangements, in the appointment of the Ecclesiastical Magistracy, the Archbishops and Bishops.

8. The State has in all ages exercised the power of

dealing with ecclesiastical endowments by altering the boundaries of dioceses and parishes, by resettling ecclesiastical estates, and by rearranging benefactions.

9. The State has in all ages exercised a right of restraint over ecclesiastical jurisdiction by forbidding ecclesiastical legislation, by allowing and restraining ecclesiastical appeals, and by prohibiting, within certain limits, the issue of ecclesiastical sentences.

10. The State, while exercising the right to limit the Church's power of legislation, has not the right to make canons, but has recognised it as belonging to the Church; while exercising the right to authorise and enforce the Liturgy, it has not the right of making a Liturgy; and, while exercising the right to restrain ecclesiastical censures, has not the right to authorise secular officials to issue such sentences.

11. The State has a right to control ecclesiastical Judicature, and to remedy complaints of a lack of justice, by staying the execution of sentences and by directing the hearing of appeals.

12. The laity have the right to enforce the maintenance of authorised religious teaching by the machinery of the accepted Church constitution.

13. The machinery by which the State ascertains the observance of the terms on which ecclesiastical endowments and jurisdictions are retained, should not be vexatious on the one hand, or revolutionary on the other.

14. In case of any readjustment of rights and duties between Church and State, the clergy have a right to accept or refuse by the action of their representative assemblies.

15. Recent changes having done much to alter the balance in Church and State, the Church has a right to demand a readjustment on the ancient lines, limited by what is called the Reformation Settlement.

16. Recent legislation having, by the removal of certain ancient departments of jurisdiction from the ecclesiastical to the Civil Courts, weakened the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, both as to authority and as to the possession of skilled

and experienced judges, some measures should be taken for strengthening the Ecclesiastical Judicature.

17. It is important that any attempt to settle and strengthen Church Judicature should proceed on a statesmanlike plan, and not be a mere attempt to stop gaps and obviate incidental discontent by improvised remedies. Such an attempt can only be made by a careful following up of the lines of Ecclesiastical Constitution, and not on speculative utilitarian principles or on the analogies of political economy.

Supposing now that attempts are to be made on these principles or any corresponding with them, before attempting a scheme we have to ask (1) what shall be the qualifications of the Court, and (2) what shall be the character of the law?

Granted that the Crown is supreme in all causes temporal and spiritual, how would the recognition of that fact involve the necessity of making the Court consist of spiritual or temporal persons? I do not think that I need discuss that as a matter at issue between the present contending parties, as the one would probably refuse any spiritual persons at all, and the other would determine that, if any were admitted, their spiritual qualifications were to all intents and purposes nullified by their position in a Court constituted by the State; I am not aware that the objection could be got over by the consent of the Convocations to accept the Court offered for final appeal. Possibly it might, but we are a long way from any such settlement. All this has been debated over and over again, and I will not trouble you with a reiteration.

I am afraid that I must add that, to my mind, the second question wears only one aspect. The law to be declared must be the law of the Church of England as it has existed in practice since the abolition of the papal power; including the accepted laws of uniformity, the articles, the canons of 1605 as modified since, the decisions of competent Courts on particular cases, so far as those decisions can be regarded as authoritative beyond the special case in

which they were given ; and such a residuum of the ancient Canon Law of Christendom as is not set aside by the submission of the clergy in 1532 and subsequent legislation, or such as can plead constant practical validity as having been received and acted upon in our Courts since.

I am afraid that notwithstanding all that has been said and written about the Canon Law in late years, I cannot regard the *Corpus Juris Canonici* as containing for individual clergymen any directive authority. Whatever may have been its status as compared with Common Law and Statute Law before the Reformation, and its relation to the administration of the Courts of England—and on this, as some of you may be aware, my own conclusions have been seriously questioned by lawyers and clergy lately—I cannot believe that there ever was a time when it was possible, or that there is now a right for anyone bound by loyal sanctions to the law of the Church of England, and the authority which he acknowledges in his ordination, to pick out of a great mass of jurisprudence, most of whose conditions are altogether passed away, a system by which he should consider himself, his conscience, or his school, to be bound.

And if not in the *Corpus Juris* (in which the men of the Reformation did recognise some scintillæ of legality to inhere, until they were able to produce their substitute, a substitute which was only produced to be rejected), how can it be found in the texts and rubrics of the Missal or other service-books which were and are explicitly disavowed in the Church and her services as well as in her jurisprudence? I say no more about it.

Well, I have no doubt said more than I need have said, and, considering the present projects of legislation, more perhaps than I ought to have said, more than it was wise for me to say. But I have not ventured into special detail, either on the vexed question of the episcopal veto, or on the minute features of a possible reconstruction.

I will not ask you to debate whether a Bishop should be deprived of the power to determine what any magistrate in any town Court can determine, whether a suit brought

into his Court may be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious—or whether he is to be treated as plaintiff, judge, and defendant in his own Courts, as liable to pay the costs of all three parties, himself being unable to plead, testify, or determine; or many of the minute points which, notwithstanding their obviousness and necessity, are so terribly awkward and expensive in the working. These are not for us here. But I may, if you will listen to me, read to you the account of a castle in the air which I built in 1883, and which, being a monstrosity, as it was called at the time, deserved the destruction it met with, rejection by twelve votes to four.

It was a resolution for the scheme of reform of the Final Court of Appeal: an alternative scheme to be recommended in the Report of the Commission:—

“That for lack of justice at or in any of the Courts of the Archbishops of this realm, it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the Queen’s Majesty in Council; and that, upon every such appeal, the petition of the appellant shall be referred to the Lord Chancellor to examine into the same and report his opinion thereupon to Her Majesty at that board; and that, if the Lord Chancellor certify that, on consideration of the petition, and having heard parties by their counsel, he considers the points of law which arose on the proceedings so important that it is fit they should be heard and determined in the most solemn manner, he shall further report what those points are, and whether they are points concerning temporal right or spiritual law; and thereupon it shall be ordered that the points defined to be of temporal or civil right be determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (or by the House of Lords, if Her Majesty with the advice of the Privy Council shall so please); and the points defined to be of spiritual law by the Archbishops and Bishops of the two provinces, who shall for the purposes of these appeals be constituted and recognised as a Court of doctrine.”

I now come to the consideration of what I have called

the literary or academic side of what we are calling the crisis, that which concerns the present state and origin of parties in the Church of England.

Under this head I propose to make a few remarks on only two points—the use of the word Protestant in reference to the history and doctrinal attitude of the Church of England; and the place which what is called the Oxford Movement had and has in the development of the Church work of the present century.

Protestantism.

I may as well put in the forefront of my remarks that I think that there ought to be no hesitation in admitting that the Church of England since the Reformation has a right to call herself, and cannot reasonably object to be called, Protestant. Her attitude in relation to the see of Rome has been, from the reign of Henry VIII., with the exception of the reign of Queen Mary, an attitude of protest. It might be an interesting inquiry to ascertain exactly the dates at which the term Protestant in its original limited sense, beginning at the diet of Speyer, became a part of the English language; and by what stages the original limited sense, early enough applied as a designation of individual professors or reformers, was extended collectively to all the confessions and communities that adopted this attitude. Probably in the writings of theologians it retained its limitation, as contrasted with the denomination of Reformed, until the Thirty Years' War had shown to Lutherans and Calvinists alike the oneness of their cause as against Rome. It was only in a loose way that in the days of Hooker our Church could have been called Protestant; by the time of Chillingworth the transition of meaning must have been accepted, and when in the Declaration of Charles in 1642, and in the coronation oath of William and Mary the religion of the Church of England is described as Protestant Reformed religion, the word was simply meant to denote the denial of Roman claims.

There can be no doubt that the English Reformation

owed a good deal to German Protestantism ; the text of the Book of Common Prayer, and some part certainly of the personal history of our reformers, would be quite sufficient to prove this. In the same way the hand of the Reformed or Geneva school, in both discipline and doctrine, appears undeniably in the Church politics in the century of Puritan struggles ; and in the history of the Lambeth Articles and of the deliberations of the Synod of Dort, the Calvinistic influence more nearly affected the doctrinal views of English theologians than that of the Lutherans, as Protestants, had ever done.

And yet the Church of England, Protestant as her attitude was, and strongly inclined to the Reformed dogmatism as her theologians occasionally were, was never committed by any act of her own, or by the nation speaking through her or for her, to any of the confessions which, in doctrine or discipline, competed for the leading place among Protestant communities ; still less did she commit herself to any discipline that would have robbed her of her Catholic and historic character. That the action of the Puritans was sufficient to forbid.

Whilst, then, her whole history for the last three centuries is in continuous protest against papal assumption, usurpation, and false doctrine, it cannot for a moment be maintained that she is, or ever has been, bound to any of the dogmatic utterances or disciplinary machinery of any of the communities that have called themselves Protestant ; or that, in her nearest approach to them, she has done anything inconsistent with her independent and Catholic identity. Her history and her symbolical books are her own ; within these terms various doctrinal influences, and more or less intimate sympathies, Lutheran, Calvinist, Zwinglian, have had their range ; but, by God's mercy, she has been kept from such corporate identification with any of them as would imperil her status as a member of the Catholic Church judged by the true Catholic standards. She may be a Protestant Church, but her Protestant attitude is the complement of her Catholic history.

Whilst, however, I distinctly claim for our Church her

full Catholic character unembarrassed by any such committal, I would in the strongest way condemn the idea that would repudiate the name of Protestant as a mere name of negation, as well as the notion that the maintenance of Protestant negation is the whole or the most important part of our religious work and history. I should unhesitatingly reject the theory that regards Protestantism by itself, either at home or abroad, as a religious system devoid of spiritual constructive energy.

Protestantism liberated in the age of the Reformation forces of religious working which had been long cramped and depressed. It was not done without much of the risk of reaction; it was done with much waste of time and strength and logic; and with much loss of charity, as is exemplified in the controversial struggles which have gone on, within and without its area, ever since.

But it was done. Theology, even through the miserable caricature of controversy, began the great work of realising the truth and efficacy of the Word of God. Even the rivalry of competing and contending confessions deepened and widened the knowledge of the law of God. One to another, and to the watching Churches, the bearers of the light ministered light even through the contention and strife which by God's grace were kept from extinguishing it. And the missionary work of the Gospel gained, it may be surely said, more than it lost; far off as we still may be from that manifestation of unity in which the world shall know the message of Him who was sent for the saving of it. It cannot be maintained that Protestantism, even in its most meagre aspect, can be regarded as outside the discipline by which good has been worked within and without the Church in the changes of the years of the right hand of the Most Highest.

The Protestant Religion is, I think, the historical and reasonable expression for collective application. I do not like the term *the Protestant Church*, or *the Protestant Faith*. If the words mean any real thing, they must mean the Catholic Church or the Catholic Faith, set free from Roman subjection and what that subjection implies:

the Catholic Church system and the Catholic Faith, in various combinations, with various limitations and various sad variations in doctrine and discipline, organic imperfections even, which the grace of Him who is the Head of the Body will set right in His good time. I protest, however, most strongly against the use of the venerable word as a colourable description of a negative and persecuting policy ; a policy which is just now proceeding to assail, one after another, the great historic and theological truths on which the character of the Church of England is based, and which is trying to force into every country parish the elements of controversy, the suggestions of treachery and falsehood, which are to poison the whole relations of the pastor and the people.

The Oxford Movement.

The other point on which I want to put a word or two on record—on such record as a Visitation Charge can put anything—is that of the place which what is called the Oxford Movement, the movement represented by the *Tracts for the Times*, Tractarianism as it is still called, by the work of Keble and Pusey, the earlier work of Newman, the later work of Charles Marriott and Liddon, has in the history of English religion. We know too well by now how that movement is at present regarded in certain popular circles ; as a reactionary, disloyal, underhand, intriguing conspiracy of a few not very able but very pertinacious traitors, to lead us on or to lead us back to the state of things from which the Reformation rescued us, the state of sacerdotalism, Jesuitry, antiquarian dogmatism, effete ritualism, immoral dependence on exploded ordinances, false morality, and venal repentance, and that system of direction and discipline which ages of corruption had devised to make the world comfortable in sinning. Very hard language is current about this—language which those who know the truth can tolerate because it carries its own refutation ; but which is convincing enough to the class of people who will believe any evil about men and parties with whom they do not agree, and who have

neither the power nor the means nor the will to criticise such accusations. It is a strange thing that after sixty years of hard work, spiritual, moral, intellectual; work in parishes, schools, brotherhoods, sisterhoods, hospitals, and missions; work on old and on new models; and work permeated with prayer in every detail, the odium of Tractarianism is weighing down now, after all those years of patience, many good enterprises, simply on the strength and density of such prejudice.

It is of course impossible for me to treat this in any detail at all. Fortunately we have in the memoirs and correspondence of some of the chief workers of the Oxford Movement more than sufficient evidence to convince honest men of the falsity of the charges, if they would only read them: and they are more likely to read them than to read my words about them. But I wish, as I said, in a few sentences to state my view of the place of the movement in our own history: not as exemplifying the mischiefs of the strife of parties, or the personal agencies acting for or against the success of either; but as trying to trace the development for the strengthening of good influences and spiritual life which God has given us by these means; given us in earthen vessels it is true, and sometimes through men who failed us in the most critical time of trial, but still marking the life of our Church in a grand period of her growth.

We must look back further than to the year 1833. I must remind you that the revival of spiritual energy, of which the Evangelical and the High Church movements are to some extent the rival agencies, was not peculiar to England; it was a revival going on all through Europe, partly following from a reaction against the state of things which politically was broken up by the French Revolution, and partly by the need of resistance to the state of things that followed that crucial and typical turning-point.

Before the Revolution religious life throughout the West had been dropping into a state of semi-consciousness; it was largely political and very inactive for good work; not, however, so far as to extinguish good influences which,

attenuated and repressed, checked and ridiculed, when they made themselves apparent, still kept alive traditions and principles of a great past. This is true of the Roman as well as of the Protestant communities.

The Revolution broke up this somnolent condition, and when it had passed away, left Europe, England, States and Churches too, in great danger of solution, and in even greater danger from the measures devised to prevent it. By-and-by the purer air prevailed; men began to recognise their shortcomings; even whilst we were being shaken by the forces of the Revolution, the formation of the great societies for missions and education showed where the line of life was to look for revival. Then came an age of reform, of liberal reform, premature in its theories, unfair in its estimates of good and evil, of old things and new, but zealous and somewhat extravagant in its methods. As the air cleared the men of thought saw more clearly into the past, and tried to see into the future; did see in the present what measures of change it was well to promote and what to resist. A wave of revival passed over our Christendom; I should hope that its effects are still working, and we ourselves working in them.

But whilst we regard this as a sort of physical explanation of semi-physical phenomena, we see at the same time that, when religious life was roused into new energy, it had to begin with the elements that had lived and worked through the semi-conscious period and the reaction that followed. I will not trouble you with speculations on what took place abroad, although the history of German thought and of Roman developments are interesting as parallels and contrasts to our own experiences.

Confining ourselves to England, we see the rise in succession of two considerable schools: the Evangelical school looking back through Newton, Romaine, Scott, and other well-known leaders, to the higher theology of the Puritans, and the popular movements of Whitfield and Wesley; and the High Church school, as it was called, looking through a narrow but well-defined succession of teachers and workers to the age of the Nonjurors and

of Law, and through them to the Caroline divines, to Andrewes, and Laud, and Hooker, and the constructive theology of the Reformation. You may observe my omission of some great names, such as Butler, but we have to remember that the energy of the religious action of his day was directed mainly against shallow intellectual infidelity, and, with all its sincerity and forcible logic, did not produce much effect on the moral and spiritual lethargy of the Hanoverian period.

There were thus two schools of reviving religious energy within the Church of England as without it. I think that this is a true account of their origin and revivals. They had their natural home, one at Cambridge, the other at Oxford, with some little inheritance of rival politics and rival forms of scholarship; and they inherited some of the older watchwords, Calvinism and Arminianism, for instance, and theories that are denoted by those names. So they stood when we older ones began to know right from wrong.

I am taking the privilege of an old man in speaking at this length, and still more in speaking a word of personal experience. If I am wrong, please pardon me, it is soon said. I began life in a centre of Evangelical energy; a real school of life, narrow it may be, even slightly Calvinistic in its attitude of dogma, but most devoted, generous, studious; too much self-contained to be uncharitable, and placidly recognising its position as a true and faithful guardian of souls, although not the only one: on the whole in a minority of influence, but not ambitious, thoroughly pastoral, given to missionary and school work quite in advance of common opinion, and above all things devoted to the study of the Bible. I have often thought that, if I had had time to write a history of that time and neighbourhood, I could have drawn a picture that would put more modern pretensions to shame, both as to work and as to spirit. From such a training I came to Oxford: in my first term I looked on at the break up of the Tractarian phalanx, as it was called, the crisis of Ward and Newman and the shock to the Church, and the dismay that followed. So I saw from the beginning the working

of the continuous life of the faithful men of the movement, many of whom I learned to know and love. I had already tried to understand the provocative process which had been at work in the contest for the Poetry Professorship which preceded the crisis and began the bitterness. And I was well aware of the social results that followed the work of Dr. Hook and the parochial side of Church revival in the North. And so my later experience grew out of my earlier: I trust by real growth, certainly not by antagonism or reaction, for I knew so much that was good in both schools that I may have gone too far perhaps, here, as elsewhere, to elaborate a theory, a consciousness of continuity. I thank God for the blessings I have had from both; and there is nothing more painful to me than to see them, as occasionally one must see them, in a rivalry that scarcely remembers charity.

I have no wish to characterise by personalities my experience of the later phases: fifty-five years of Oxford life must stand rather as the warrant of my authority to speak than of my inerrancy of judgment. And I would not like to tinge the view that I am trying to put before you by throwing the shadow of the present on the past. At the risk of repetition, I will say to you what I said thirty-two years ago, when, in some respects, things were looking darker than they look now.

"The energy of the revival" (I was speaking of the renewal of energy in the first years of this century) "was anti-dogmatic and sentimental rather than critical: it was partial, and contained in itself the element of weakness and narrowness. So far, the same may be said of both the parties that divided it; the one active, benevolent, uncritical; the other active, benevolent, and fastidious; the one was learned and unimpassioned, the other full of zeal but despising knowledge.

"The Evangelical reaction soon outran its companions—its plans of usefulness became rapidly popular, and the very easiness of its formula contributed to make the profession of religion itself comparatively easy. For the first thirty years of the century all the popular religion

ran in this groove: exposed to much obloquy from the enemies of religion, but ending in making its way and working out some great results.

“ At the end of that period we saw a further step: a new movement that originated in the revival of learning, in the consciousness that zeal and personal piety are, without fixed views of truth and the power of defending them, an inadequate safeguard against infidelity, and that a new training must be gone through before the Church of that generation was fit to meet its foes. I need not, cannot dwell on the minutiae of that awakening. We all know how it grew and how it did its work. We know how far it failed and how far it succeeded; that so far as personal influences and disproportioned views of truth went, it failed, exposing its workers to intolerable trials in the way of calumny and persecution, and driving into controversial extremes the energies that should have been suffered to work out the thoroughly dogmatic revival. But, practically, the results of that short work were wonderful, to be seen in every village church, to be heard in every sermon, to be felt in the administration of every parish. Never since the Reformation had there been such a change, and the influences that wrought it were more intellectual and more spiritual than those which effected the Reformation.

“ All that was personal and simply reactionary in that movement failed; all that was of principle and that tended to progress and edification succeeded. Far beyond the range of personal and scholastic interest, the influence has won its way. In the deepening of knowledge, in the immense improvement in education, in the vast and rapid extension of the Church in the Colonies, the true Church of the future, in the development of Christian art, in the infinite opening up of new work for roused spiritual energies, that movement has done a work that can never, on a broad view of history, seem of less than the first importance. ‘ Their sound went into all lands. . . . ’ Yet, ‘ we learned that our treasure was in earthen vessels, that the excellency may be of God, and not of us.’ ”

When I spoke thus, the reaction that was before my mind

was a reaction into intellectual degeneration. A phase of that has passed over us, and has taken, and is still taking, new forms, out of which our Almighty Lord, in the versatility of His husbandry, will assuredly bring us confidence and strength in victory.

There has been time for other developments ; and recrudescence periods of wanton disloyalty and controversial intolerance, of which in 1867 we had scarcely a notion, much less a prospect : a state of things which was stimulated by the events of 1874, and which seems to have reached a climax now. For I cannot conceal from myself that it is from a perverse exaggeration of some of the principles of the Oxford Movement, and a disproportionate treatment of points of order and ritual, which the first and second series of workers in that movement had overlooked or neglected, that some of the ritual extravagances which are now troubling us have resulted. They have been, I believe, misconstrued by critics in a way against which wise cautions and careful instructions might at one period have safeguarded them. They have been treated by opponents as implying more than legal disloyalty, absolutely immoral and treasonable perversity, and such treatment has naturally served to exasperate the temper and to harden the obstinacy of the offenders. The ignorance of neophytes has further complicated the difficulties of managing and repressing absurdities.

Of this, at this moment I am not bound or disposed to speak. It is a matter of great grief to me ; but of one thing I am sure, that the disloyalty of one extreme wing of the present combatants, if I am to call them so, is as far from the doctrinal and disciplinary policy and character of the Oxford Movement as the intolerant agitation, which I spoke of at first, is against the devoted, loving, and generous policy and character of the Evangelical school as I knew it years ago, and as from my heart, I believe, that I know it in this diocese to-day.

I thank God that in this diocese I can rely on the loyalty of both the schools and on their willing co-operation in good work. But we are a part of a great Church in which

there are troubles that cannot but affect us. We pray our Captain of Salvation to rule and govern and guide us, that we may fight a good fight against the abundant evil, being at peace one with another.

Sacerdotalism.

The more general and organised attack on the Church of England through the clergy, which is at present in the course of development, although I must say that I hope that it has reached its climax, or its bathos, may, I think, be characterised as having for its cry the charge of sacerdotalism. I do not wish to say much about this, because I know that every word I may say is only too likely to be misinterpreted, if not actually misrepresented. But I must not dismiss the crisis without a few words to indicate where I see the possibility of violent attack and weak defence. Sacerdotalism is not only an awkward war-cry, but it is a point of attack, or the name, I should say, is given to a point or points of attack, which require not only firm and discreet, but intelligent and honest defence.

I do not see why I should hesitate to express my grief and disgust at the ways in which this word has been used of late years, not only in the simple but honest ignorance of parliamentary utterances, but in the speeches and letters of men who might be expected to know better and to be more careful of their language. For indeed, in the wide phalanx of assailants, the word "sacerdotalism" is employed so comprehensively that it seems to include everything that anybody can dislike, and as all people do not like the same things, it includes a great deal that an educated Churchman believes to be historically and theologically true and precious: the use of the Creeds, the law of marriage, education at the Universities, the Authorised Version of the Bible, intercourse with foreign Churches, the progress of modern science, the history of the Court of Delegates, the consecration of Barlow and Parker, the practice of evening Communion, and social questions upwards and downwards, not forgetting the abuses resulting

from the practical profanation of the Lord's Day. Like the French use of the word "clericalism," it is made to cover anything that anybody who can make his voice heard may wish to challenge as being above or below his own standard of faith, morals, or manners. This is no caricature.

There is no novelty in this. The reformers of the sixteenth century, judged by their utterances recorded by Foxe, seem with some variation of words to comprehend in the term all things objectionable, to accumulate on the priests, against whom they were arrayed, all the iniquities that all priests of all ages and all religions had brought upon society, all their sins, their pretensions, and their mischiefs. Luther held much the same opinion about Bishops, and was followed by the Puritans of the next generation, who followed him in little else. It is a grievous proof of the existence of some unchangeable features of religious history, that we find in the current literature of the day specimens of the ribald profanity of the Martin Marprelate controversy, which was the great disgrace of Puritanism.

Sacerdotalism is a term of censure, reproach, and stigma, applied by controversialists to those who hold erroneous views, or views opposed to their own, on the Christian Ministry ; and, of course, by those who reject the Christian Priesthood altogether, to those who believe and maintain it. The word means different things, or different views of the same things, in the mouths of those who discuss it without regard to this distinction. Those, for instance, who appeal to great names of scholars and divines, as having proved that there is no such thing as sacerdotalism warranted in Holy Scripture and primitive antiquity, should be warned that they ought to be quite sure that the sacerdotalism which they attack is indeed the same thing that the scholars to whom they appeal have treated of ; as well as to inquire whether other quite as great scholars have not proved that the principles assailed have the fullest warrant that the study of history and the Word can give. It is well, before we attempt to balance authori-

ties, to ascertain that the scholars and divines are treating of the same thing. So, too, when we are told by one assailant that at the Reformation the Church of England finally and summarily broke with sacerdotalism, and immediately after by another, equally positive, that the Prayer Book is full of sacerdotalism and requires to be revised before it can be regarded as expressive of the religion of the Reformation, we can see at once that the word means, must mean in the mind of the speakers, two different things, or two very different aspects of the same thing; or else that one or both of their statements is false.

The word, however, as it seems to be thus generally applied in the present debate, would cover the whole system, doctrinal and disciplinary, which rages round the institution of the Christian Priesthood, and however the Christian Priesthood is defined, limited, or extended, with all its history, its sanctions, its developments, its functions, its powers, its uses, and its abuses—for we can deny neither.

What is the root of our offence? Has He not said, "As My Father has sent Me, even so send I you"? Are we not heirs of the promise, that "He who receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me"? Are we to renounce our high calling because it has been misinterpreted, or even because it has been misused? "Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office of a priest in the Church of God." Surely it is a high dignity and a weighty office and charge to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord.

Together with the dignity goes the responsibility, the onerous responsibility of the charge. Professional assumption, the airs and graces of which are alike fatal to the character and to the usefulness of the man who asserts them; the attitude of the clergyman who stands or sits aloof from his flock, oftener to be found in his study, waiting to be consulted, than in the schools gathering in the lambs, or in the lanes gathering in the outcasts, or in the homes of the poor, ministering the comfort of sympathy in

things secular as well as spiritual—assumption, the ostentatious exhibition of the clerical form of self-sufficiency—the ridiculous pretension to austerity that is of mere mannerism; the claim of special rights of not being contradicted or advised—the position asserted in the words, which we sometimes hear of as spoken by the young clergyman who has not yet learned the burden of sympathy or the invaluable remedy of humility, “I am a priest”—with no realisation of the mind that was in Christ Jesus;—all this, be it real and guilty, or unreal and silly, or however else it may be, is an offence greater against the Lord and the brethren and the flock than against the world outside. But it is not the sacerdotalism of which the outcry just now proclaims the danger and the risk. The danger and the risk is about the idea itself, not about the caricature of it detected in the mannerism of weak men. The struggle and the crisis is about something far more real, deeper, more general, and essential. What can it be?

Well, the root of the matter must be sought in the demand which the spiritual nature of man makes and which religion tries to satisfy—the demand for a higher sanction of law and conduct than the unassisted reason without revelation can furnish; such sanction must be provided by the agency of one who can claim authority, by a class that claims authority, and that an authority that rests on spiritual assumptions admitted by the faith of believers. Any authority of any form of religion is open to this inevitable charge of sacerdotalism, the original offensiveness of the claim to be received as authoritative, on other grounds than the mere voluntary adhesion, or the personal apprehension of the man on whom it is brought to bear. Under so wide a generalisation must come many things that are good and true, and many that are false and evil.

It would be impossible for me to attempt to calculate the combinations in which the element of sacerdotalism may be traced; or to differentiate the forms in which such assumptions may clothe themselves in various departments of life. It is just possible, and must be sufficient for us

now to see how the application of the term to the position of our ministry and the system of the Church becomes of practical importance; that is, how and where the attack is serious and sincere, and aimed at something which, although misunderstood, is real; and consequently how the misunderstanding may be got rid of and the defence be effectual.

1. The commission of the ministry of Bishops, priests, and deacons cannot be exempted from the schedule of things open to the general charge of sacerdotalism, for it claims a higher sanction than the will of the congregation to which it ministers, and appeals to external historical evidence which the congregation may judge, but can neither make nor unmake.

2. The doctrine of the Sacraments is a doctrine which claims for them a divine authorship, the authority of a divine command, and the certainty that there is a higher agency than the will of man engaged in their operation and validity; to which the unbelief and misuse of the recipients may present a bar, but which is not created by their faith or made unreal by their misuse or neglect.

3. The discipline of religious authority is a discipline which is not to be restricted exclusively to our own Church or community, but which bases its authority on the Word of God as the Word of God, in definite historic interpretation, and in the experience of the lives which have grown up under it.

Of course, these points do not cover the whole ground to which, as a name of disreputable connotation, it may be made to extend. But they are points on which the original hostility that gives the reproach naturally and instinctively fixes itself. They are the points in the constitution of Churches which contain the reality of the thing, and in which, accordingly, religious controversy, as well as popular prejudice, find their easiest approach. I suppose one might say that the origin of the objection lies in the presumed intervention of a human element, as a vehicle of the working of the Spirit of God; that is the ideal

working of the corporeity of the Church through her ministers.

If I have in this approximated to the reality of the idea that is the inspiring idea of the attack, it is unnecessary, and, indeed, impossible, to work out the detail of either that or the defence that is required. If I am wrong, it would be not only unnecessary, but misleading.

But let me say a word of caution on two points which, in the popular mind, give colour and complexion to the method of attack, and which we cannot afford, and, indeed, do not desire, to disregard. Please to remember that I am trying to treat the question not on its whole merits, but on the conditions of its present development; and that a word of caution is not a treatise, or discussion of argument, for or against.

First, then, we are told that sacerdotalism is an injury to the laity; and, second, that in the Church of England it is an infection of popery.

1. The Church does not consist of the clergy alone; it contains the laity also—laity with rights and duties; laity the majority, at all events, of the flock, for the sake of which the ministry exists. That is true; it is of the very fundamental truth of Church life: the minister of the Church is the servant of his flock before God, and the servant of God to them; if that consideration is eliminated, sacerdotalism richly deserves all the evil that is said of it. It is one thing to say this and to say it heartily; it is another thing to listen with patience to the saying, "The laity are against you, the laity are your masters; what they want to hear you are to preach; what they do not want to hear you are not to preach. You are their paid servants; obey their command, give way to their outcry, or your incomes shall be stopped. They have outgrown pupillage; do as the laity bid you."

When we hear this—and when and where do not we hear it?—we have to ask who are the laity; what right have their self-authorized champions to use their name; what are their rights and duties; what are the legal and constitutional conditions according to which their influence

can be rightly employed, or has been rightly used to affect the conduct of their ministers—their Bishops, priests, and deacons?

A wise defence involves the consideration of all this, and much more. The Puritan agitator is not the laity; and the machinery of agitation is more like a counter-sacerdotalism than the work of an organised, or even disorganised, constituent of the one body of the Church of God.

When we talk about the laity in this connexion, let us try to be clear as to who they are, and what they say, and within what laws and conditions they have a right to say what they do say. It will not be done in a quarter of an hour.

Then there is the old cry about popery. Sacerdotalism has infected the clergy—sacerdotalism is, or involves all that is in popery: the work of the Reformation was the emancipation from sacerdotalism.

2. Well, we are Protestant. True. These things and ideas exist in popery; we must have nothing to do with them. What are we to say now?

The difficulty of dealing with this phase is considerable. We know what the points at issue between our Church and the Roman Church are: they have been worked threadbare in the discussions of the last two, of the last three hundred years. We know what we hold in common; we know that for many centuries our forefathers, to whom, humanly speaking, we owe the maintenance of Christian life in this land, held the faith, mixed and confounded with much Romish error, but still the faith of Christ, by which we spiritually live. But we know also the points at issue, at what cost we gained them, and what we owe to them and those who won them. But the people who attack us, as sacerdotalists and Papists in disguise, are on quite a different level and theory. Perhaps we do not realise their points or their prejudices; most certainly they do not realise ours.

I do not think of the few Roman Catholics that I know as out of the pale of charity. I do not think or believe

that the converts of the present century are, taken as a whole, representative of the popular idea of Jesuitry ; I do not imagine that any one of them, certainly none whom I have known, made his change without deep searchings of heart, or forfeiture of something that was very precious. I do know that of the errors against which we as Protestants protest, there is not one that is not caused by the disproportionate treatment of some element of some greater truth. But how can we join in a cry that confounds all persons and things ; and how can we profit by a defence that entirely disregards the consideration of the points about which the conflict of opinion rages ? Are we traitors because we cannot join in a war against the whole catholicity of the Church, Roman or Protestant alike ? Can we welcome the aid of parties and partisans whose arguments and tactics embarrass us at every turn, and threaten to demolish, not at all all that we attack, but pretty nearly all that we have to defend, and the means which we have to defend it ? Again I say, when we are talking about popery, let us be quite sure that what we defend is worth defending, and what we attack is worth attacking. We shall not learn it in the arena of present controversy.

But these matters cannot be disposed of by general charges, however elaborated, or general defences, however comprehensive. There is no branch of life's work into which religion does not enter ; there is no form of religion into which the risk of the abuse of spiritual influence may not enter ; there is no region of human influence into which the controversy of sacerdotalism cannot be forced by those who will condescend to use a catching term of opprobrium, half understood and entirely misused. The debate, if it is to be a debate, must be on definite lines and definite topics. It is as absurd to say that everything Roman is false, as to say that everything Roman is true : or to say that everything sacerdotal is right, as that everything sacerdotal is wrong : or to say that that only is Catholic on which the seal of Rome is set, or that only Protestant that denies something on which the awakened

sense of the Reformation pronounced a hasty condemnation. Well, in saying this, I am indulging in the very form of generalisation against which I am protesting. *Dolus latet in generalibus*; they who are to strive in these matters must strive discreetly, and strive lawfully. And may it not be well sometimes to remember the caution: "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men"?

Controversy.

A final word on controversy—it must needs be, for men's minds, attitudes, and circumstances differ so widely even whilst they look on the same truths and uphold them as truths. But woe to the man by whom, whether through neglect of duty, or intolerance of difference, or the arrogance of ignorance, or that self-confidence of self-will which is practically unbelief, the offence cometh.

The malice which is the cancerous bane of controversy, the malice of misrepresentation, of ready belief of evil, of the imputation of hateful motives; the ignoring of all good in the opponents, and the instinct for discovering moral evil in that which one dislikes, the malice of overstatement for or against, an overstatement that leads the controversialist imperceptibly far away from the original position of truth that he justified himself in defending; the malice of misconstruction, of anonymous charges, and cruel personalities:—

This is what demoralises theological discussion, and so spreads widely and deeply the form of unbelief which is most critical in these days—the fatal impression on the many who are so easy to alienate from the faith, that those who contend in ways and on principles irreconcilable with the theory that they are defending cannot and do not believe in their own cause: and the terrible corruption of mind and manners as well as of religion which historically and logically follows ever on an age of controversial embitterment. Men will not believe the truths that do not bring with them the strong evidence of charity, and which those who maintain them maintain with weapons abso-

lutely forbidden by the law that they would say they strive for.

Nothing in this world can justify the malice of controversy—no, not even the love of the Eternal Truth, if we could conceive it to operate in combination with it. No truth in the world is worth fighting for with weapons like these: nothing in the world is so certain as, and nothing in heaven more certain than, the authority of the law of love.

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.

EDITED BY

REV. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.,

CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF ST. PAUL'S,

AND THE

REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE MISSIONARY COLLEGE, DORCHESTER.

THE object of this **Series** is to supply some carefully considered teaching on matters of religion to that large body of devout laymen, who desire instruction, but are not attracted by the learned treatises which appeal to the theologian. One of the needs of the time would seem to be, to translate the solid theological learning, of which there is no lack, into the vernacular of everyday practical religion; and while steering a course between what is called plain teaching on the one hand, and erudition on the other, to supply some sound and readable instruction to those who require it, on the subjects included under the common title, "The Christian Religion," that they may be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear.

The point of view from which the different subjects are treated may be briefly described as that dogmatic basis of the Tractarian Movement with which the name of Oxford will ever be associated.

Crown 8vo, price 5s. each Volume.

FIFTH IMPRESSION.

RELIGION. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

"The *Oxford Library of Practical Theology* makes a good beginning with Canon Newbolt's volume on religion. . . . The publishers have spared no pains in making the appearance of the volumes as attractive as possible. The binding, type, and general "get up" of the volume just issued leave nothing to be desired."—*Guardian*.

THIRD EDITION.

HOLY BAPTISM. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Principal of Dorchester Missionary College.

"Few books on Baptism contain more thoughtful and useful instruction on the rite, and we give Mr. Stone's effort our highest approval. It might well be made a text-book for candidates for the diaconate, or at least in theological colleges. As a book for thoughtful laymen it is also certain to find a place."—*Church Times*.

THIRD IMPRESSION.

CONFIRMATION. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

"To the parochial clergy this volume may be warmly commended. They will find it to be a storehouse of material for their instruction, and quite the best treatise that we have on the subject it treats. It is thoroughly practical, and gives exactly the kind of teaching that is wanted."—*Guardian*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology—continued.

Crown 8vo, price 5s. each Volume.

THIRD EDITION.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

"Mr. Pullan's book will no doubt have, as it deserves to have, a large number of readers, and they will gain a great deal from the perusal of it. It may be certainly recommended to the ordinary layman as by far the best book on the subject available."—*Pilot*.

SECOND EDITION.

HOLY MATRIMONY. By the Rev. W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

"Canon Knox Little has given us a most exhaustive treatise on Holy Matrimony written in his best and happiest style, and giving ample proofs of wide research and deep study of the various aspects, and the essential characteristics of Christian marriage. . . . We would strongly advise the clergy to place this work upon their shelves as a book of reference, while it forms a complete manual of instruction to aid them in the preparation of addresses on the subject."—*Church Bells*.

SECOND EDITION.

THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. H. V. S. ECK, M.A., Rector of Bethnal Green.

"The teaching is sound, and the book may be placed with confidence in the hands of candidates for Orders or of intelligent and educated lay people who desire fuller instruction on the central doctrines of the Faith than can be provided in sermons."—*Guardian*.

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. E. T. CHURTON, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nassau.

"We welcome Bishop Churton's book as an authoritative exposition of the modern High Church view of Missions. It is good for us all to understand it, thereby we shall be saved alike from uninstructed admiration and indiscriminate denunciation."—*Church Missionary Intelligencer*.

SECOND EDITION.

PRAYER. By the Rev. ARTHUR JOHN WORLEDGE, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro.

"We do not know of any book about prayer which is equally useful, and we anticipate that it will be a standard work for, at any rate, a considerable time."—*Pilot*.

SUNDAY. By the Rev. W. B. TREVELYAN, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Westminster.

"An extremely useful contribution to a difficult and important subject, and we are confident it will rank high in the series to which it belongs."—*Guardian*.

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

"It is intended to illustrate the continuity and the value of Christian tradition in conduct, belief and worship. . . . Mr. Pullan affirms that the critics of orthodox Christianity are now destroying one another's theories much more than they are destroying the Catholic Faith. However that may be, his book should render some assistance in determining what is and what is not 'The Faith once delivered to the Saints'. It is a worthy addition to the series to which it belongs."—*Westminster Gazette*.

DEVOTIONAL BOOKS. By the Rev. CHARLES BODINGTON, Canon and Treasurer of Lichfield.

"Extremely valuable for its high tone, fidelity to Catholic standards, and powerful advocacy of reality in private devotion. To those who have never studied the subject, it should reveal a mine of devotional wealth, yet to be worked with profit to man and glory to God."—*Church Times*.

HOLY ORDERS. By the Rev. A. R. WHITHAM, M.A., Principal of Culham College, Abingdon.

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology—continued.

Crown 8vo, price 5s. each] Volume.

THE BIBLE. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Principal of the Missionary College, Dorchester. *[In preparation.]*

THE CHURCH CATECHISM THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *[In preparation.]*

RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester. *[In preparation.]*

VISITATION OF THE SICK. By the Rev. E. F. RUSSELL, M.A., of St. Alban's, Holborn. *[In preparation.]*

CHURCH WORK. By the Rev. BERNARD REYNOLDS, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's. *[In preparation.]*

Handbooks for the Clergy.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ARTHUR W. ROBINSON, B.D.,

VICAR OF ALLHALLOWS BARKING BY THE TOWER.

Crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d. net each Volume.

THE purpose of the writers of this Series is to present in a clear and attractive way the responsibilities and opportunities of the Clergy of to-day, and to offer such practical guidance, in regard both to aims and to methods, as experience may have shown to be valuable. It is hoped that the Series, while primarily intended for those who are already face to face with the duties and problems of the ministerial office, may be of interest and assistance also to others who are considering the question of entering into Holy Orders. ¶

¶ THIRD IMPRESSION.

THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE CLERGY. By the EDITOR.

"It is a short book, but it covers a wide field. Every line of it tells, and it is excellent reading. Not the least valuable part of the book are the extremely apt and striking quotations from various writers of eminence, which are placed in the form of notes at the end of the chapters. It is emphatically a book for both clergy and laity to buy and study."—*Church Times*.

"We are grateful for a little book which will be of service to many priests, young and old. We need more priests, and such a book may well increase their number by explaining the nature of the life to which a vocation to Holy Orders calls men; but we need still more that priests should realise the life to which they are called and pledged; and this they can hardly fail to do if they listen to Mr. Robinson's prudent and tender counsels."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

SECOND EDITION.

PATRISTIC STUDY. By the Rev. H. B. SWETE, D.D.,

Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

"The whole of the work which this little volume contains is most admirably done. Sufficient is told about the personal history of the Fathers to make the study of their writings profitable."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

"This is an admirable little guide-book to wide study by one who well knows how to guide. It is sound and learned, and crammed full of information, yet pleasant in style and easy to understand."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

SECOND IMPRESSION.

THE MINISTRY OF CONVERSION. By the Rev. A. J.

MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury.

"It will be found most valuable and interesting."—*Guardian*.

"Canon Mason has given a manual that should be carefully studied by all, whether clergy or laity, who have in any way to share in the 'Ministry of Conversion' by preaching, by parochial organisation, or by personal influence."—*Scottish Guardian*.

Handbooks for the Clergy—continued.

Crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d. each Volume.

THIRD IMPRESSION.

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Tasmania, Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

“Bishop Montgomery's admirable little book. . . . Into a limited compass he has compressed the very kind of information which gives one an adequate impression of the spirit which pervades a religion, of what is its strength and weakness, what its relation to Christianity, what the side upon which it must be approached.”—*Church Quarterly Review*.

SECOND IMPRESSION.

THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS. By the Very Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

“Nothing could be more desirable than that the Anglican clergy should be equipped with knowledge of the kind to which this little volume will introduce them, and should regard the questions with which Biblical study abounds in the candid spirit, and with the breadth of view which they see here exemplified.”—*Spectator*.

“The little book on the Gospels, which the new Dean of Westminster has recently published, is one to be warmly commended alike to clergy and laity. Any intelligent person who takes the trouble to work through this little volume of 150 pages will be rewarded by gaining from it as clear a view of the synoptic problem as is possible without prolonged and independent study of the sources.”—*The Pilot*.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC. By the Very Rev. WILFORD L. ROBBINS, Dean of Albany, U.S., Author of “An Essay toward Faith”.

“We commend this handbook with confidence as a helpful guide to those clergy and teachers who have thoughtful doubters to deal with, and who wish to build safely if they build at all.”—*Church of Ireland Gazette*.

“The Dean of Albany has produced one of the most valuable of Evidential treatises published in our time. It is all the more available for practical use, because there is not, from beginning to end, a word to indicate the ecclesiastical location or proclivity of the writer. The book will be as welcome to the Free Churchman as to the Anglican.”—*Sunday School Chronicle*.

PASTORAL VISITATION. By the Rev. H. E. SAVAGE, M.A., Vicar of South Shields, and Hon. Canon of Durham.

“[This is an excellent] book.”—*Spectator*.

THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. W. E. COLLINS, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, and Chairman of the Church Historical Society. *[In preparation.]*

AUTHORITY AND THE PRINCIPLE OF OBEDIENCE. By the Very Rev. T. B. STRONG, D.D., Dean of Christ Church. *[In preparation.]*

SCIENCE AND RELIGION. By the Rev. P. N. WAGGETT, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. *[In preparation.]*

LAY WORK. By the Right Rev. HUYSHE YEATMAN-BIGGS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Southwark. *[In preparation.]*

CHURCH MUSIC. By MADELEY RICHARDSON, Mus. Doc. Organist of St. Saviour's Collegiate Church, Southwark. *[In preparation.]*

INTEMPERANCE. By the Rev. H. H. PEREIRA, M.A., Vicar of Croydon, and Hon. Canon of Canterbury. *[In preparation.]*

SCHOOLS. By the Rev. W. FOXLEY MORRIS, M.A., Rector of Barnsley, and Hon. Canon of Worcester. *[In preparation.]*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

